Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
03-1400 APR 05 2004

No. _____

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS, GUSTAVO LUIS "GUS" GARCIA, and CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS,

Appellants,

v.

RICK PERRY, Governor of Texas, *et al.*,

Appellees.

On Appeal From The United States District Court For The Eastern District Of Texas

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

RENEA HICKS
LAW OFFICE OF
MAX RENEA HICKS
800 Norwood Tower
114 West 7th Street
Austin, Texas 78701
(512) 480-8231
fax: (512) 476-4557

Attorney for Appellants

COCKLE LAW BRIEF PRINTING CO. (800) 225-6964
OR CALL COLLECT (402) 342-2831

QUESTION PRESENTED

Does the legal fiction of inter-censal population accuracy provide a safe harbor from the stringent one person, one vote constitutional rule for congressional districts when the state voluntarily redistricts mid-decade only to advance partisan objectives and not out of any judicial or other legal necessity?

LIST OF PARTIES

Plaintiffs and Plaintiff-Intervenors below:

Travis County, Texas; City of Austin, Texas; Gustavo Luis "Gus" Garcia; Eddie Jackson; Barbara Marshall; Gertrude "Traci" Fisher; Hargie Faye Jacob-Savoy; Ealy Boyd; J. B. Mayfield; Roy Stanley; Phyllis Cottle; Molly Woods; Brian Manley; Tommy Adkisson, Samuel T. Biscoe; David James Butts; Ronald Knowlton Davis; Dorothy Dean; Wilhelmina R. Delco; Samuel Garcia; Lester Gibson; Eunice June Mitchell Givens; Margaret J. Gomez; Mack Ray Hernandez; Art Murillo; Richard Raymond; Ernesto Silva; Louis Simms; Clint Smith; Connie Sonnen; Alfred Thomas Stanley; Maria Lucina Ramirez Torres; Elisa Vasquez; Fernando Villareal; Willia Wooten; Ana Yañez-Correa; Mike Zuniga, Jr.; Walter Session; Morris Byers; Frenchie Henderson; American GI Forum of Texas; Simon Balderas; Gilberto Torres; Eli Romero; League of United Latin American Voters District 7; League of United Latin American Voters; Webb County; Cameron County; Juanita Valdez-Cox; Leo Montalvo; William R. Leo; Coalition of Black Democrats; Texas NAACP; Lester Bellow; Homer Guillory; John Bland; Rev. Willie Davis; and Congressmembers Sheila Jackson Lee, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Chris Bell, Gene Green, and Nicholas Lampson

Defendants below:

State of Texas; Rick Perry, Governor of Texas; Geoffrey S. Connor, Secretary of State of Texas; David Dewhurst, Lieutenant Governor of Texas; Tom Craddick, Speaker of the Texas House of Representatives; Charles Soechting, Chair of the Texas Democratic Party; Tina Benkiser, Chair of the Texas Republican Party

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Question Presented	i
List of Parties	ii
Table of Authorities	v
Opinion Below	1
Jurisdiction	1
Constitutional Provisions Involved in the Case	2
Statement of the Case	3
Redistricting in 2001	4
Redistricting in 2003	5
Post-census population changes in Texas	6
The Question is Substantial	9
I. The equal population rule for congressional districts permits only unavoidable variances from absolute equality, and Plan 1374C's variances, as well as everything else about it, were entirely avoidable	10
II. There is no constitutional link between official decennial population data and the one person, one vote rule	12
III. The legal fiction of inter-censal population stasis is inapplicable to the state's voluntary mid-decade redistricting, and permitting the state to use it as a defense is fundamentally at odds with the underlying rationale for the fiction	13
Conclusion	15

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

Page

Appendix

Memorandum Opinion, *Session v. Perry*, Civ. Action No. 2:03-CV-354 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 6, 2004) 1a

Judgment, *Session v. Perry*, Civ. Action No. 2:03-CV-354 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 15, 2004) 157a

Notice of Appeal, *Session v. Perry*, Civ. Action No. 2:03-CV-354 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 9, 2004) 158a

Notice of Appeal, *Session v. Perry*, Civ. Action No. 2:03-CV-354 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 7, 2004) 161a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

Baker v. Carr, 369 U.S. 186 (1962) 1, 12

Balderas v. Texas, 536 U.S. 919 (2002) 5

Bush v. Martin, 251 F.Supp. 484 (S.D. Tex. 1966) 12

Central Greyhound Lines, Inc. v. Mealey, 334 U.S. 653 (1948) 14

Davis v. Bandemer, 478 U.S. 109 (1986) 11

Director, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs v. Perini North River Associates, 459 U.S. 297 (1983) 1

Gaffney v. Cummings, 412 U.S. 735 (1973) 13

Georgia v. Ashcroft, 123 S.Ct. 2498 (2003) 13

Karcher v. Daggett, 462 U.S. 725 (1983) 10, 11, 14

Kirkpatrick v. Preisler, 394 U.S. 526 (1966) 11, 12

Perry v. Del Rio, 66 S.W.3d 239 (Tex. 2001) 4

Session v. Perry, 298 F.Supp.2d 451 (E.D. Tex. 2004) 1

United States v. Markgraf, 736 F.2d 1179 (7th Cir. 1984), *cert. dism'd*, 469 U.S. 1199 (1985) 14

Wesberry v. Sanders, 376 U.S. 1 (1964) 10

White v. Weiser, 412 U.S. 783 (1973) 12

Wisconsin v. New York, 517 U.S. 1 (1996) 12

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY AUTHORITY

U.S. CONST. ART. I, § 2, cl. 1 2

U.S. CONST. ART. I, § 2, cl. 3 2

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Page

U.S. CONST. AMEND. XIV, § 2 3

13 U.S.C. § 141(c) 4

28 U.S.C. § 1253 2

28 U.S.C. § 2284 1

2003 Texas House Bill 3, 78th Leg., 3d C.S. (Oct. 12, 2003) 3

OTHER AUTHORITY

TEX. ATT'Y GEN. OP. GA-0063 (April 23, 2003) 5

L. Fuller, *Legal Fictions*, 25 Ill. L. Rev. 513 (1931) 14

L. Fuller, *Legal Fictions*, 25 Ill. L. Rev. 877 (1931) 14

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

Travis County, Gus Garcia, and the City of Austin (collectively, "Travis County appellants"),[1] urge the Court to take jurisdiction over this appeal and reverse the judgment below.

OPINION BELOW

The opinion of the district court is reported at 298 F.Supp.2d 451 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 6, 2004) and reprinted at App. 1a-156a.

JURISDICTION

The three-judge district court convened pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2284 and issued its opinion on January 6, 2004, denying the injunction requested by the plaintiffs and plaintiff-intervenors. App. 124a. Travis County and

[1] Gus Garcia is a citizen and registered voter residing in Travis County and the City of Austin. Joint Final Pretrial Order, Stip. E.23. He and other voters raised the same one person, one vote challenge to the state's congressional redistricting raised by Travis County and Austin. *Id.*, ¶ D.1(h) (adopting ¶ D.10(a)). His standing to raise the constitutional challenge obviates any need for the Court to evaluate the thus far unchallenged standing of Travis County and Austin. *See Director, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs v. Perini North River Associates*, 459 U.S. 297, 303-05 (1983) (presence of one party with standing assures that controversy before the Court is justiciable). In the seminal case of *Baker v. Carr*, 369 U.S. 186 (1962), the Court took this same tack on standing, reserving decision on whether cities had standing to raise the one person, one vote issue. 369 U.S. at 204 n.23.

the City of Austin filed their notice of appeal on January 9, 2004. App. 158a. Gus Garcia filed his notice of appeal on January 7, 2004. App. 161a-162a. This Court's jurisdiction rests on 28 U.S.C. § 1253.[2]

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED IN THE CASE

Article I, section 2, clause 1, of the Constitution of the United States provides in relevant part:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States. . . .

Article I, section 2, clause 3, of the Constitution of the United States provides in relevant part:

> Representatives . . . shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective Numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole Number of free Persons, including those bound to Service for a Term of Years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three fifths of all other Persons. The actual Enumeration shall be made within three Years after the first Meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent Term of ten Years, in such Manner as they shall by Law direct. . . .

[2] On February 25, 2004, in No. 03A739, the time for all appellants to file jurisdictional statements was extended to April 5, 2004.

Section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides in relevant part:

> Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. . . .

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This appeal is from the district court decision upholding the validity of the statewide Texas congressional redistricting plan, designated Plan 1374C, enacted on October 12, 2003, in the third special session of the 78th Texas Legislature.[3] The Travis County appellants raised their one person, one vote challenge to Plan 1374C at every possible stage of the litigation;[4] however, the Court's written rulings ignored the claim even after debate on it in summary judgment, opening, and closing arguments. The Court rejected all the claims of plaintiffs and plaintiff-intervenors in its final decision.

---

[3] 2003 Texas House Bill 3, 78th Leg., 3d C.S. (Oct. 12, 2003).

[4] As already indicated in fn. 1, above, the County, the City, and Garcia specifically identified one person, one vote as an issue in the Joint Final Pretrial Order. The precise issue was further addressed in written motions for summary judgment (which were denied, *see* App. 26a), evidence (which was admitted without objection, *see* Travis County/City of Austin Exhs. 1 and 2), and the County and City's post-trial brief.

Redistricting in 2001

The 2001 congressional redistricting for Texas provides essential context. Federal reapportionment of congressional seats following the official 2000 census occurred on December 28, 2000; Texas received two additional seats, bringing its total to thirty-two. *Perry v. Del Rio*, 66 S.W.3d 239, 244, 254 (Tex. 2001). On March 12, 2001, the Census Bureau delivered block-level census data sufficient to redistrict Texas' then-malapportioned districts. *Del Rio*, 66 S.W.3d at 244, 254; Joint Pretrial Order Stip. E.82; App. 3a.[5]

The Texas legislature, however, was unable to pass the necessary new congressional plan by the end of its regular session in late May of 2001. *Del Rio*, 66 S.W.3d at 246. The Governor ended any possibility of legislative action before the 2002 congressional elections on July 3, 2001, when he formally announced his decision not to call a special session on congressional redistricting. *Del Rio*, 66 S.W.3d at 243 & n.7.

Following state court proceedings that ended without a congressional plan, a three-judge federal court for the Eastern District of Texas, in *Balderas v. Texas*, stepped forward to perform the redistricting task to, among other things, "bring the district map into line with the equal population rule[.]" App. 25a. The *Balderas* decision and accompanying congressional map, designated Plan 1151C, issued on November 14, 2001, and the plan was used for

[5] The statutory deadline for the Census Bureau to deliver such data is April 1st of the year after the census is completed. 13 U.S.C. § 141(c).

the 2002 congressional election cycle. Joint Final Pretrial Order Stips. E.2, E.70. The state did not appeal but others did, and this Court summarily affirmed the decision and Plan 1151C's validity. *Balderas v. Texas*, 536 U.S. 919 (2002).

Redistricting in 2003

The 2002 elections changed partisan control of the Texas legislature, but not the partisan balance of the Texas congressional delegation, where ticket-splitters maintained Democratic members in a tenuous majority. App. 31a. Early in the 2003 regular session, the Chair of the state House Committee on Redistricting requested the Texas Attorney General to determine whether state law mandated legislative action on congressional redistricting. The Attorney General determined that the *Balderas* plan would remain effective for the remainder of the decade in the absence of state legislative action and that legislative action on the matter was not required. Tex. Att'y Gen. Op. GA-0063 (April 23, 2003).

The legislature tried to moved forward with the task anyway. After failing to enact a new congressional redistricting plan in the regular session and two special sessions of the legislature, the new majority prevailed in a third called session.[6] On October 12, 2003 – two years and

[6] The out-of-state flight of Democratic legislators in the Texas House and Senate to deprive the legislature of the quorum necessary to enact the congressional redistricting legislation was widely chronicled. *See* App. 4a-5a (summarizing efforts).

seven months, and one full round of elections, after receiving census numbers sufficient for redistricting – the Texas legislature enacted Plan 1374C. The "single-minded purpose" behind Plan 1374C was "to gain partisan advantage." App. 31a.

Post-census population changes in Texas

The state "did not make any effort to determine the current populations of the congressional districts . . . as of October 12, 2003." Joint Final Pretrial Order Stip. E.85. Instead, it relied exclusively on the uncorrected census numbers from before the 2002 elections. *Id.*[7]

Undisputed trial evidence, though, from Austin's official demographer shows huge changes in the size and dispersion of Texas population between the March, 2001, release of the official census data for redistricting and Plan 1374C's enactment. *See* Travis County/City Exh. 1.[8] "[R]apid and spatially uneven population surges and declines" made the 2000 block-level population data from the census "old and specious" both statewide and in local communities. *Id.* More than a million persons – enough for still two more congressional seats – had been added to the Texas population in the interim. *Id.* And the rapidly rising Hispanic share of the population meant that Plan 1374C

---

[7] Before enactment of Plan 1374C, the Census Bureau issued corrected (not updated) official census numbers for Texas, adding thirty people to the state's total population count and shifting some population clusters between counties and cities. *See* Travis County/City of Austin Exh. 2. Plan 1374C ignored the corrected census count.

[8] Declaration of Ryan Robinson: Post-Census 2000 Demographic Change in Texas.

districts were drawn that "do not fully reflect the current size and spatial scope of the state's largest and most rapidly expanding minority community[.]" *Id.* The result of all this growth and its uneven spread was that Plan 1374C's use of 2000 census block data left the "resultant districts . . . not balanced with each other in terms of population." *Id.*[9]

While Plan 1374C ignored these population changes in its one person, one vote calculus, those charged with redrawing the lines assuredly did not in their political calculus. Representative King sponsored the redistricting bill in the House and led the House's map-drawing effort. App. 35a, 113a. He testified at trial, for example, about his concerns during the mapping effort about whether new Congressional District 4 (running along the Red River) would fall into the Republican column in the upcoming election and explained that he designed it so that the population growth he saw there would let it "grow into" a Republican district during the decade. Trial Tr., 12/18/03.[10]

---

[9] The population estimates and updates of the official state demographer for Texas, who did not testify or opine during the litigation, reflects similarly dramatic intra-state population shifts and growth, county-by-county, after the 2000 census. *See* http://www.txsdc.tamu.edu/tpepp/txpopest.php (website of Texas State Data Center and Office of the State Demographer). For example, from 2000 to 2003, Travis County's population had increased by 30,546 people, while its less populous neighbor to the immediate north, Williamson County, had grown by 40,388 people. The City of Laredo, whose division in Plan 1374C split the district court over the legality of Congressional District 23, *compare* App. 68a-102a (majority) *with* App. 129a-151a (dissent), grew by 11.0% in the same time period, adding 19,488 people.

[10] "Grayson and Collin counties are fast-growing Republican areas." The long-time Democratic incumbent, Cong. Ralph Hall, has since switched parties and is running for re-election as a Republican.

He identified new Congressional District 12 as a district drawn to take advantage of quite recent trends in population shifts in Wise County not far from Fort Worth. Trial Tr., 12/18/03. The Senate's own chief staff map-drawer, Bob Davis, testified that he thought it "silly" to use 2000 census numbers to draw congressional maps in 2003 to meet the one person, one vote standard. Trial Tr., 12/18/03.[11]

The picture, then, is this. The legislators, politicians, and their map-drawing staff all had an eagle-eye on post-census population developments and carefully crafted Plan 1374C to use them to further their partisan objective. The district court blessed this use of post-census population shifts and even used later elections, in 2002, to condone the lines drawn as a consequence. Yet, when it came to applying the bedrock constitutional doctrine giving rise to the modern era of redistricting and redistricting litigation, the court turned a judicial blind-eye to the large and undisputed population shifts that had occurred during the same post-census period. Its conclusion, implicit though it may have been, was that, while politics may take the reality of population shifts into account to ensure a shift of power between political parties, the Constitution may not take the same realities into account to ensure a shift of power for the people who are to be represented.

[11] "I thought it was silly to make that assumption in a state as big as Texas."

THE QUESTION IS SUBSTANTIAL

It is important to answer the question whether the Court will maintain, in the extraordinary circumstances of the 2003 Texas congressional redistricting saga, the acknowledged legal fiction that district populations remain static between decennial censuses for purposes of applying the equal population rule. There are two reasons. First, if the Texas effort is legally countenanced, it nearly certainly will become anything but extraordinary and will instead become a historical prototype for unending redistricting. Second, the very reason for the legal fiction is to avoid the necessity of frequent redistricting, yet Texas seeks the fiction's protection for precisely the opposite reason: to permit frequent redistricting. Redistricting in mid-decade *only* for partisan gain, in the complete absence of any legal necessity, is a pioneering political idea. The Court's decision at the idea's maiden voyage on whether a transparent fiction will be used to ease the dubious effort, when the effort is in fundamental opposition to the reason for the fiction's use, will determine whether a fundamental constitutional principle of equality will be used in a new way to ease future voyages of the same ilk or, instead, serve as a simple, firmly embedded constitutional breakwater.

The district court was plainly troubled by the vexing new development. It acknowledged that the "most compelling arguments" against mid-decade redistricting arise from the "impropriety . . . of frequent redistricting." App. 26a. It even deemed the question of "how much of a role the judiciary ought to play in policing the give-and-take of redistricting" the "most important" question. App. 38a. Yet, after catching a fleeting vision of the solution to reining in partisan gerrymanders – favoring judicial limitations

focusing on the "*time* and circumstance of partisan line-drawing instead of the "'some but not too much'" approach, App. 40a (emphasis added) – the district court puzzlingly overlooked a constitutional doctrine already at hand. Applying the one person, one vote rule urged here, and jettisoning the fiction of inter-censal accuracy when there is no reason to indulge it, is a simple solution, grounded in established constitutional doctrine. At the same time, it does not rigidify the system with structural prohibitions. Abandonment of the inter-censal accuracy fiction means only that, if a state voluntarily undertakes uncoerced congressional redistricting in mid-decade to further partisan ends, it must affirmatively work at the same time to develop and use the population data necessary to satisfy the strict equal population rule.

I. The equal population rule for congressional districts permits only unavoidable variances from absolute quality, and Plan 1374C's variances, as well as everything else about it, were entirely avoidable.

The issue presented here rises directly from the Court's one person, one vote jurisprudence in the congressional context. *Wesberry v. Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1 (1964), held that Article I, section 2, of the Constitution sets a constitutional standard of equal population among the districts. In *Karcher v. Daggett*, 462 U.S. 725 (1983), the Court held that this standard permits only limited, "*unavoidable*" variances from a good-faith, absolute equality requirement. 462 U.S. at 730 (emphasis added).

In actual fact, Plan 1374C will never have satisfied *Karcher*'s good faith, absolute equality requirement, not at its inception and not in any point over the four election

cycles it is designed to span. The Texas population had shifted from the census-painted picture in dramatic ways by the Fall of 2003. And, when the legislature enacted Plan 1374C, it insisted on using the increasingly stale census population data in a way that was entirely avoidable. In short, the indisputable fact of its gross departure from actually meeting one person, one vote standards directly contradicts *Karcher*'s insistence that only "unavoidable" departures are permitted.

The desire to right perceived past partisan wrongs that some say drove Plan 1374C's passage cannot justify these avoidable departures. The Court has explained that "[p]roblems created by partisan politics cannot justify an apportionment which does not otherwise pass constitutional muster." *Kirkpatrick v. Preisler*, 394 U.S. 526, 533 (1966).[12]

In the face of these constitutional imperatives, the state's retreat to the only redoubt it can find – the legal fiction of inter-censal population accuracy – should be blocked. The 2000 census is not a constitutional defense to the one person, one vote challenge, and applying the inter-censal fiction in these circumstances would be a perversion of the rationale for its existence.

---

[12] *Cf. Davis v. Bandemer*, 478 U.S. 109, 149 (1986) (J. O'Connor, concurring) ("the one person, one vote principle safeguards the individual's right to vote, not the interest of political groups").

II. There is no constitutional link between official decennial population data and the one person, one vote rule.

The Court has indicated that the link between decennial census data and redistricting is *not* a constitutionally mandated one.[13] It has observed the important consequences of census data, "*not* delineated in the Constitution" for drawing intrastate political districts. *Wisconsin v. City of New York*, 517 U.S. 1, 5-6 (1996) (emphasis added). In *Kirkpatrick v. Preisler*, the Court acknowledged that, if established with a high degree of accuracy, intra-census population shifts may be taken into account in applying the equal population rule in congressional redistricting. 394 U.S. at 535; *see also White v. Weiser*, 412 U.S. 783, 792 n.12 (1973) (same).

Similarly, in rejecting a structural constitutional argument against mid-decade redistricting, the district court here rejected the proposition that there is a constitutional link between the Census Clause and the one person, one vote rule: "[T]he Census Clause does not mention the states or their power to redistrict[.]" App. 12a-13a.[14]

---

[13] If, on the contrary, there is a constitutional link, then the structural constitutional arguments against mid-decade redistricting made by some of the plaintiffs in the district court rise as a valid constitutional challenge to the Texas congressional redistricting in 2003.

[14] Consistent with this de-linkage approach, an early post-*Baker v. Carr* Texas case on redistricting approved the concept of the state looking beyond the increasingly stale 1960 census population numbers in drawing its congressional districts. *See Bush v. Martin*, 251 F.Supp. 484, 517 n.107 (S.D. Tex. 1966) (3-judge court).

The absence of a constitutionally-mandated link between the official census numbers and the equal population rule, combined with the undisputed fact that the actual population numbers for Plan 1374C's districts were not equal among the districts when the plan was enacted, leaves the state only one defense: the inter-censal accuracy fiction.

III. The legal fiction of inter-censal population stasis is inapplicable to the state's voluntary mid-decade redistricting, and permitting the state to use it as a defense is fundamentally at odds with the underlying rationale for the fiction.

The Court has remarked on the snapshot nature of the census count, noting that, as actually is demonstrated in this case, "[d]istrict populations are constantly changing, often at different rates in either direction, up or down." *Gaffney v. Cummings*, 412 U.S. 735, 746 (1973). As a consequence, the Court recently highlighted the way census numbers are used in redistricting:

> When the decennial census numbers are released, States must redistrict to account for any changes or shifts in population. But before the new census, States operate under the *legal fiction* that even 10 years later, the plans are constitutionally apportioned.

Georgia v. Ashcroft, 123 S.Ct. 2498, 2515 n.2 (2003) (emphasis added).

The reason this fiction is deployed in redistricting is obvious. Without it, states would be subject to one person, one vote challenges to enacted districting plans every time

the population shifted enough to trigger violation of the strict rule of *Karcher v. Daggett*.

The Texas experience in 2003, though, highlights the wisdom of Justice Frankfurter's observation for the Court that "especially in the disposition of constitutional issues are legal fictions hazardous[.]" *Central Greyhound Lines, Inc. v. Mealey*, 334 U.S. 653, 660 (1948). It is one thing to indulge a legal fiction such as the one in question here when it is necessary to *force* legislative action, while still giving a solid reference point to meet the constitutional rule and minimize partisan manipulation. It is quite another thing to indulge the fiction to *permit* legislative action to meet the constitutional rule when the overweening aim of the action is partisan manipulation.

One of the leading scholars on legal fictions wrote that the "purpose of any fiction is to reconcile a specific legal result with some premise or postulate." L. Fuller, *Legal Fictions*, 25 Ill. L. Rev. 513, 514 (1931). He further warned that fictions should be treated as "servants to be discharged as soon as they have fulfilled their functions." L. Fuller, *Legal Fictions*, 25 Ill. L. Rev. 877, 898 (1931); *cf. United States v. Markgraf*, 736 F.2d 1179, 1187 (7th Cir. 1984) (J. Posner dissenting from denial of rehearing en banc) ("proper office of legal fictions is to prevent, rather than to create, injustices"), *cert. dism'd*, 469 U.S. 1199 (1985).

The reason for the legal fiction of inter-censal population stasis cannot be squared with its use by the state in its defense of Plan 1374C. Permitting its use in this case to uphold a factually malapportioned plan would create, rather than prevent, a constitutional injustice.

One last point needs to be made. This is not a simple case of burden-shifting, whereby the only way for the Travis County appellants to prevail is to prove up their own brand new set of 2003 population numbers. Meeting the one person, one vote requirement is the *state's* obligation. Undisputed evidence demonstrates that, legal fiction aside, the state has not satisfied the constitutional command in Plan 1374C. Invalidating the challenged plan on that basis would not constitute an absolute legal bar on mid-decade redistricting, even for purely partisan reasons. It would merely make it difficult, placing that burden on the state to prove its new population numbers with a "high degree of accuracy" if it wishes to proceed in that fashion. There is much to commend such a rule, both in law and in policy. It should be adopted here.

CONCLUSION

The Court should note probable jurisdiction and reverse the decision of the district court.

Respectfully submitted,

RENEA HICKS
LAW OFFICE OF MAX RENEA HICKS
800 Norwood Tower
114 West 7th Street
Austin, Texas 78701
(512) 480-8231
fax: (512) 476-4557

Attorney for Appellants
Travis County, Gustavo Luis "Gus" Garcia, and City of Austin

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION

WALTER SESSION, ET AL	§	CIVIL ACTION
	§	NO. 2:03-CV-354
V.	§	(Filed Jan. 6, 2004)
	§	
RICK PERRY, ET AL	§	Consolidated

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, Circuit Judge, and WARD and ROSENTHAL, District Judges.

HIGGINBOTHAM, Circuit Judge, and ROSENTHAL, District Judge:

Various voters, members of Congress, the City of Austin, Texas, the GI Forum, the League of United Latin American Citizens ("LULAC"), and voters of Cherokee County challenge congressional redistricting set forth in Plan 1374C, enacted into law by the Texas Legislature on October 12, 2003,[1] and precleared by the Department of Justice on December 19, 2003. Plaintiffs[2] allege that Plan 1374C is invalid because (1) Texas may not redistrict mid-decade; (2) the Plan unconstitutionally discriminates on the basis of race; (3) the Plan is an unconstitutional partisan gerrymander; and (4) various districts in Plan 1374C dilute the voting strength of minorities in violation of § 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

---

[1] 2003 Texas House Bill 3, 78th Leg., 3d C.S. (Oct. 12, 2003).

[2] To avoid unnecessary confusion, we will attribute the arguments raised against Plan 1374C to the Plaintiffs as a group. We recognize, of course, that each Plaintiff has brought distinct arguments to the table.

We hold that Plaintiffs have failed to prove that the State statute prescribing the lines for the thirty-two congressional seats in Texas violates the United States Constitution or fails to comply with § 2 of the Voting Rights Act. We also reject Plaintiffs' argument that the Texas Legislature lacked authority to draw new districts after a federal court drew them following the 2000 census.

We decide only the legality of Plan 1374C, not its wisdom. Whether the Texas Legislature has acted in the best interest of Texas is a judgment that belongs to the people who elected the officials whose act is challenged in this case. Nor does the reality that this is a reprise of the act of the 1991 State Legislature weigh with the court's decision beyond its marker of the impact of the computer-drawn map. This extraordinary change in the ability to slice thin the lines brings welcome assistance, but comes with a high cost of creating much greater potential for abuse. Congress can assist by banning mid-decade redistricting, which it has the clear constitutional authority to do, as many states have done. In Texas, the phenomenon is new but already old. The larger lesson of 1991 and 2003 is that the only check upon these grasps of power lie with the voter. But, perversely, these seizures entail political moves that too often dance close to avoiding the recall of the disagreeing voter. We know it is rough and tumble politics, and we are ever mindful that the judiciary must call the fouls without participating in the game. We must nonetheless express concern that in the age of technology this is a very different game.

Part I presents the factual background of the case. Part II addresses whether Texas had the legislative authority to draw new district lines mid-decade. Part III addresses generic claims that challenge the map as a

whole, namely, claims of racial discrimination and partisan gerrymandering asserted to be unconstitutionally extreme. Part IV lays out the legal principles governing our analysis of Plaintiffs' more specific claims. Part V addresses the § 2 vote dilution claims as directed toward the Dallas-Fort Worth area, as well as the other potential influence districts in East and Central Texas. Finally, Part VI addresses the § 2 vote dilution and *Shaw* claims directed at districts drawn in South and West Texas.

I

The U.S. Census Bureau released the 2000 decennial census in March 2001. As a result of its population growth, Texas was due two additional seats in the House of Representatives, bringing its total to thirty-two. Texas in turn had to draw thirty-two equipopulous districts to account for its additional representation and to meet the constitutional requirement of one man, one vote. Under Texas law, the Texas Legislature had the task of drawing the districts.[3]

Despite the imminency of state primary elections, the 77th State Legislature failed to adopt a redistricting plan. Lawsuits in state and federal court followed. Voters and others requested that the court draw a new map. The *Balderas* court deferred to state court efforts to adopt a state redistricting plan. When these state court efforts failed, we recognized that the State's existing congressional districts were unconstitutionally malapportioned

[3] *See Perry v. Del Rio*, 67 S.W.3d 85, 91 (Tex. 2001).

and reluctantly accepted the duty to prepare a new, constitutional plan.

Without a baseline state plan in place, the court invited the parties to submit redistricting recommendations. Following a bench trial, the panel applied neutral districting factors and adopted Plan 1151C to govern the State's 2002 elections. The panel refused suggestions not required by law and rejected policy choices better left to legislative consideration.

Balderas ultimately ordered that Plan 1151C would govern the 2002 congressional elections.[4] Certain plaintiffs representing Hispanic voters appealed the decision, arguing that the panel erred by not drawing an additional Hispanic district in the Southwest region of the state. The Supreme Court summarily affirmed.[5] As a result of the 2002 elections, the Texas congressional delegation included seventeen Democrats and fifteen Republicans. However, with their newly drawn state districts, legislative Republicans gained control over both houses of the Texas State Legislature, as well as control over all prominent Executive Branch positions.

The Texas Legislature revisited redistricting in 2003. The Legislature was unable to adopt a new plan during the 2003 regular session, in part because Democratic House members, by absenting themselves, denied a quorum. Governor Perry called the Legislature into special session. During the first special session, the House approved a new

---

[4] *Balderas v. Texas*, No. 6:01-CV-158, slip op. (E.D. Tex. Nov. 14, 2002), *aff'd mem.*, 536 U.S. 919 (2002).

[5] *Balderas v. Texas*, 536 U.S. 919 (2002).

congressional map, but the Senate failed to do so because its "two-thirds" supermajority rule permitted the Democrats to block a vote. To break the impasse, Lieutenant Governor Dewhurst announced that he would suspend operation of the two-thirds rule in any future special session considering congressional redistricting legislation. Although Democratic legislators again attempted to prevent formation of a quorum, the 78th Legislature ultimately was able to accomplish during its third special session what the 77th Legislature could not: pass a congressional redistricting plan, Plan 1374C.

II

Plaintiffs argue that Texas lacks the power, under either the Constitution or the election statutes, to redraw congressional districts in the middle of the decade. Some Plaintiffs find this limitation implicit in the text of the Elections Clause, while others urge that Congress has affirmatively limited state authority to redistrict by § 2c of Title II.[6] A third strain of arguments focuses on the *Balderas* judgment and asserts either that the judgment collaterally estops the State from enacting a new plan or that the judgment exhausted the State's authority to redistrict.

Although there are compelling arguments why it would be good policy for states to abstain from drawing district lines mid-decade, Plaintiffs ultimately fail to provide any authority – constitutional, statutory, or judicial – demonstrating that mid-decade redistricting is

---

[6] 2 U.S.C. § 2c (2003).

forbidden in Texas. In fact, what meager authority we have found seems to allow the states to redraw lines mid-decade, at least where a court drew the existing lines within the decade. As we will explain, the Elections Clause of the Constitution grants states broad power to regulate the "time, place, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives."[7] Congress has the power to override state regulations or to impose rules of its own, but it has not chosen to limit redistricting to the period immediately following the release of the decennial census. Judicial decisions, both by the Supreme Court and by district courts throughout the country, have allowed and even invited states to redraw district lines following a court's action.

Against this backdrop of authority, we cannot agree that either the Constitution or the voting statutes restricts the states to once-a-decade redistricting. We therefore reject the argument that the Texas Legislature had no authority to draw the lines of congressional districts and deny Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment.

A

The Constitution of the United States delegates to states the power to develop procedures governing congressional elections by the Elections Clause. It provides:

> The times, places and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each state by the legislature thereof;

---

[7] U.S. CONST. art. I, § 4.

> but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.[8]

This provision delegates to state legislatures both the power and responsibility to redraw congressional voting districts.[9] States do not possess this authority as an incident of their sovereignty. Rather, the Elections Clause delegates power to the states in broad terms. While states may only enact "time, places and manner" regulations, the text does not define or otherwise limit the states' discretion. Nonetheless, Congress may, if it chooses, make regulations governing the "times, places and manner" of holding elections or alter regulations enacted by state legislatures. This reservation to Congress, however, is not a direct limitation on the scope of the states' authority; rather, it allows Congress to override state election decisions or to enact regulations of its own. Unless and until Congress chooses to act, the states' power to redistrict remains unlimited by constitutional text.

Plaintiffs would read an implicit, temporal limitation into the text of the Elections Clause, but the argument is empty. The argument is that the Elections Clause allows Congress to pass laws regulating elections "at any time," but does not explicitly allow states to act at any time. Plaintiffs reason that, by failing to include the phrase "at any time" within the grant of power to states, the Elections Clause implicitly denies that power. Hence, they conclude, the Elections Clause allows states to draw

---

[8] U.S. CONST. art. I, § 4.

[9] *See, e.g., Smiley v. Holm*, 285 U.S. 355, 366-67 (1932).

districts only once, immediately after the release of each decennial census.

We are unpersuaded. The argument tortures the text of the Clause, which by its clear terms has no such limitation. That Congress may exercise its power at any time says nothing of the states' power to enact election regulations, especially when the states are given this authority in terms that suggest no restriction beyond those that Congress may impose. To paraphrase the argument, if the Framers had intended to limit the states' power in such a specific way, surely they would have done so explicitly. This is just too convenient and tailored. For the first fifty years of our Nation's history, it was not uncommon for representatives to be chosen in statewide, at-large elections;[10] states often did not divide into congressional districts. The notion that the Elections Clause somehow embodies an implicit limitation on mid-decade redistricting is therefore anachronistic at best; presumably, it never entered the Framers' minds. Even today, there is no constitutional requirement that states must necessarily subdivide their territory into districts;[11] the requirement that states draw districts is largely a creature of statute.[12]

Even if the Elections Clause did not give states the power to prescribe election regulations at "any" time, Plaintiffs do not explain why we should read the Clause to allow states to exercise election power only one time after the census or how any such interpretation could find

---

[10] *Wesberry v. Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1, 7-9 (1964).

[11] *Id.* at 8.

[12] *See* 2 U.S.C. § 2a, 2c (2003).

mooring in the text of the Constitution. What Plaintiffs ask us to do, then, is not simply to add a single limitation to the Elections Clause's grant of power; they ask that we create, out of whole cloth, a detailed scheme for states to exercise their constitutional authority. This we cannot do.

Judicial decisions have implicitly rejected the notion that a state may impose only one redistricting map each decade. While no court has, to our knowledge, explicitly addressed whether states have the power to do so under the Constitution,[13] innumerable decisions have either assumed that a state legislature may draw new lines mid-decade or have invited a state to do so after the court has drawn a map in a remedial role.[14]

---

[13] The recent decision by the Colorado Supreme Court, *People ex rel. Salazar v. Davidson*, 79 P.3d 1221 (Colo. 2003), rests squarely on state law. That court did not hold that the U.S. Constitution limits states to once-a-decade redistricting.

[14] *See, e.g., Branch v. Smith*, 123 S.Ct. 1429, 1437 (2003) (affirming the district court's imposition of a redistricting plan, but noting that the district court's "alternative holding is not to be regarded . . . as binding upon state and federal officials should Mississippi seek in the future to administer a redistricting plan adopted by the Chancery Court"); *Upham v. Seamon*, 456 U.S. 37, 44 (1982) (observing the parties' argument "that because the District Court's plan is only an interim plan and is subject to replacement by the legislature in 1983, the injury to appellants, if any, will not be irreparable"); *Wise v. Lipscomb*, 437 U.S. 535, 540 (1978) ("Legislative bodies should not leave their reapportionment tasks to the federal courts; but when those with legislative responsibilities do not respond, or the imminence of a state election makes it impractical for them to do so, it becomes the 'unwelcome obligation' of the federal court to devise and impose a reapportionment plan pending later legislative action." (internal citations omitted)); *Connor v. Finch*, 431 U.S. 407 (1977) (implicitly assuming that the state legislature could replace a "permanent" plan imposed by a district court); *White v. Regester*, 422 U.S. 935 (1975) (noting that Texas's

(Continued on following page)

The Supreme Court has intimated on several occasions that states may redistrict mid-decade following court action. In *Upham v. Seamon*,[15] the Court noted that the parties "urged that because the District Court's plan is only an interim plan and is subject to replacement by the legislature in 1983, the injury to appellants, if any, will not be irreparable."[16] Similarly, in *Branch v. Smith*, the Court noted that the district court's holding that state courts could not constitutionally create redistricting plans, a holding the Court vacated, was not "binding upon state and federal officials should Mississippi seek in the future

---

legislative plan "does not become effective until the 1976 elections"); *Vera v. Bush*, 980 F.Supp. 251, 253 (S.D. Tex. 1997) ("Because the legislature has failed to act, this Court is left with the 'unwelcome obligation' of providing a congressional redistricting plan for the 1998 and millennial election cycles *pending later legislative action.*" (emphasis added)); *Vera v. Bush*, 933 F.Supp. 1341, 1346, 1353 (S.D. Tex. 1994) ("Bullock and Laney contend that the Texas Legislature is ready and willing to redistrict during its 1997 regular session. Of course, in any event, they will have that opportunity, as this Court's remedy is an interim plan and the Court will require the legislature to prepare its own constitutional redistricting plan next year."); *Terrazas v. Clements*, 537 F.Supp. 514 (N.D. Tex. 1982) (implementing a temporary reapportionment plan that would remain "in effect for all elections through December 31, 1983, unless valid apportionment plans are enacted sooner"); *Bush v. Martin*, 251 F.Supp. 484, 517 (S.D. Tex. 1966) (tentatively approving a legislative redistricting plan, but noting that the Texas Legislature could improve the plan before the next decennial census: "We retain jurisdiction to enable the 60th Legislature, convening in January of 1967 and any special sessions convened through July 1967, to take further action.... Indeed, this very litigation in its advocative hammering out of the issues, possible standards, strengths and deficiencies of H.B. 67, has made a substantial contribution to the continuing legislative process and function as the Texas Legislature takes the second and sharper look.").

[15] 456 U.S. 37 (1982).

[16] *Id.* at 44.

to administer a redistricting plan adopted by the Chancery Court."[17] The Court's most vivid statement on the topic came in *Wise v. Lipscomb*:

> Legislative bodies should not leave their reapportionment tasks to the federal courts; but when those with legislative responsibilities do not respond, or the imminence of a state election makes it impractical for them to do so, it becomes the "unwelcome obligation" of the federal court to devise and impose a reapportionment plan *pending later legislative action*.[18]

The Court's language contemplates that any federal court plan must give way to later legislative redistricting efforts. And, of course, the displaced plan here was judicially crafted. No legislative plan is being displaced.

Given this authority and the broad language of the Elections Clause, we conclude that the Elections Clause itself – the provision in the Constitution that grants states the authority to redistrict – does not limit states to redistricting once per decade, particularly where, as here, the State's action follows a court-imposed map. If any such limitation is to be found, then it must be found elsewhere.

B

Some Plaintiffs would locate limitations in other clauses in the Constitution, most notably the Census

---

[17] 123 S. Ct. 1429, 1437 (2003).

[18] 437 U.S. 535, 540 (1978) (citing *Connor v. Finch*, 431 U.S. 407, 415 (1977) (emphasis added)).

Clause.[19] Those Plaintiffs point to two phrases which, we are told, prevent a state from redistricting any time it chooses. The Census Clause provides, in pertinent part:

> Representatives . . . shall be apportioned among the several States . . . according to their respective numbers. The actual Enumeration shall be made within three years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent term of ten years, in such manner as they shall by law direct.[20]

Plaintiffs argue that the phrase "according to their respective numbers" and the sentence requiring enumeration every ten years together impose affirmative limitations on the states' power to redistrict.

We disagree. The Census Clause by its terms applies to the apportionment of seats in the House of Representatives among the states. It ensures that no state is overrepresented in the House by linking each state's delegation to the state's population. The Clause says nothing about how district lines must be drawn. It is true, of course, that the Census Clause affects the states' obligation to redistrict. When the census is released every ten years, states are required to redistrict in order to accommodate changes in population and to bring its districts into conformity with the Equal Protection rule of one man, one vote. But the Census Clause does not expressly limit the states' ability to redistrict more frequently. Indeed, the Census Clause does not mention the states or their power

---

[19] U.S. CONST. art. I, § 2, cl. 3.

[20] U.S. CONST. art. I, § 2, cl. 3.

to redistrict,[21] and we fail to see how it can limit a power it never references.

Plaintiffs concede that the constitutional text itself is silent regarding repeated reapportionment. They nonetheless insist that the Supreme Court's decision in *U.S. Term Limits, Inc. v. Thornton*[22] prevents States from "adding" to the Constitution a provision entitling states to redistrict mid-decade. Plaintiffs' reliance on *U.S. Term Limits* is misplaced.

U.S. Term Limits was not based on the Elections or Census Clauses, but on the Qualifications Clause of Article I.[23] In *U.S. Term Limits,* the Court rejected an effort by Arkansas to impose term limits on its Representatives because a state cannot add qualifications to those enumerated in the Constitution. The Court noted that, "in certain limited contexts, the power to regulate the incidents of the federal system is not a reserved power of the States, but rather is delegated by the Constitution."[24] "In the absence

---

[21] Plaintiffs' argument depends, to some extent, on the assumption that states are required by the Constitution to draw district lines. This assumption, however, is unfounded. As we noted above, in the early years of this nation, many states did not draw district lines, but rather used statewide at-large districts. Since the Constitution itself does not require a state to draw district lines, it is difficult to see how the Census Clause could limit the states' power to redistrict.

[22] 514 U.S. 779 (1995).

[23] Article I, Section 2, Clause 2 specifies that "[n]o person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the Age of twenty five years, and been seven Years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen."

[24] *U.S. Term Limits,* 514 U.S. at 805.

of any constitutional delegation to the States of power to add qualifications to those enumerated in the Constitution, such a power does not exist."[25] Drawing on this language, Plaintiffs urge that, by undertaking mid-decade redistricting, Texas has in effect "added" to the text of the Elections Clause a power to redistrict intradecenially.

We disagree. As a preliminary matter, Texas has "added" nothing to the text of the Constitution by redrawing its district lines mid-decade. The Elections Clause is a broad grant of authority to the states that is checked only by the power of Congress to make or alter voting regulations. Nowhere in the text of the Elections Clause or in judicial interpretations is there a limitation of the frequency with which states may exercise their power. Since the power given the states is broad enough to encompass mid-decade redistricting, it cannot be fairly said – as Plaintiffs assert – that Texas has "added" anything to the Constitution's text. *U.S. Term Limits,* by contrast, dealt with a very different situation. It dealt with the Qualificatiens Clause, a provision that is of a "precise, limited nature."[26] By adding a term limit, Arkansas engrafted a provision into the Qualifications Clause that was not there before. The same cannot be said here. The Qualifications Clause in *U.S. Term Limits* by its terms gave the states no role to play in setting the qualifications of representatives.[27] The Elections Clause is different: it appeals to both

---

[25] *Id.*

[26] *Id.* at 796.

[27] Indeed, because Article I, Section 2 specifies that "the *Electors* in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the

(Continued on following page)

state legislatures and Congress to set the "time, manner and place" of holding elections. When a state exercises this authority, it adds nothing to the Constitution.

Fairly viewed, it is Plaintiffs who seek to "add" to the Constitution. They ask us to add an implicit limitation to the Elections Clause that states may prescribe the "times, places and manner" of holding elections only after each decennial census. There is no basis for this addition, either in the text of the Constitution or in court decisions interpreting it. In sum, neither the Census Clause nor the Qualifications Clause limits state power to redraw district lines intradecennially.

C

The Elections Clause grants Congress the power to pass voting regulations or to alter voting regulations enacted by the states. Several Plaintiffs argue that Congress has exercised its power to limit the authority of the states to redistrict.

The most relevant statutory provisions are in Title 2. Section 2a specifies that the President must inform Congress after each decennial census of the population of each state and the corresponding number of representatives each state is entitled to send to the House of Representatives.[28] Section 2c requires every state entitled to more

---

most numerous Branch of the State Legislature," the failure to give the states power over representatives' qualifications is all the more telling.

[28] Section 2a reads in pertinent part:

> On the first day, or within one week thereafter, of . . . each fifth Congress thereafter, the President shall transmit to the

(Continued on following page)

than one representative under these census figures to create a number of districts equivalent to the number of representatives it sends to the House.[29]

Congress has given courts a significant role in redrawing district lines. Should a state legislature not redistrict after the decennial census, for example, a court is empowered to remedy any defects in the state's maps.[30] At the same time, the Supreme Court has emphasized that primary responsibility for drawing the lines of congressional districts remains with state legislatures.[31] The Court has reaffirmed this principle in a series of decisions constraining federal courts in redistricting cases. The Court, for example, insists that the judiciary defer to

---

> Congress a statement showing the whole number of persons in each State . . . as ascertained under . . . each subsequent decennial census of the population, and the number of Representatives to which each State would be entitled under an apportionment of the then existing number of Representatives by the method known as the method of equal proportions, no State to receive less than one Member.

2 U.S.C. § 2a (2003).

[29] Section 2c provides in pertinent part:

> In each State entitled . . . to more than one Representative under an apportionment made pursuant to the provisions of section 2a(a) of this title, there shall be established by law a number of districts equal to the number of Representatives to which such State is so entitled, and Representatives shall be elected only from districts so established, no district to elect more than one Representative. . . .

2 U.S.C. § 2c (2003).

[30] *Wise v. Lipscomb*, 437 U.S. 535, 539-540 (1978); *Connor v. Finch*, 431 U.S. 407, 415 (1977).

[31] *Branch v. Smith*, 123 S.Ct. 1429, 1435 (2003); *Growe v. Emison*, 507 U.S. 25, 34 (1993).

legislative districting if the legislative plan meets population equality and racial fairness standards applicable to court-ordered plans.[32] In addition, the judicial role is remedial; courts are not to replace valid legislative judgments with their own preferences.[33] Absent evidence that a state will fail to perform its redistricting duty in a timely fashion, a federal court can neither obstruct the State's redistricting efforts nor allow federal litigation to impede it.[34] Similarly, courts conducting redistricting are obliged to honor the State's redistricting traditions.

Plaintiffs assert that § 2c constrains the power of states to redraw district lines at will. Their argument comprises three basic steps. First, in § 2c Congress revoked the power granted to state legislatures by the Elections Clause and delegated a far more limited power. Second, they urge that § 2c allows redistricting once after the decennial census. As a result, they urge that when *Balderas* imposed Plan 1151C, the judgment effectively "used up" the redistricting power delegated to the states through § 2c. Under this view, Plan 1374C is invalid

---

[32] *Upham v. Seamon*, 456 U.S. 37, 39 (1982).

[33] *Id.* ("We have never said that the entry of an objection by the Attorney General to any part of a state plan grants a district court the authority to disregard aspects of the legislative plan not objected to by the Attorney General. There may be reasons for rejecting other parts of the State's proposal, but those reasons must be something other than the limits on the court's remedial actions. Those limits do not come into play until and unless a remedy is required; whether a remedy is required must be determined on the basis of the substantive legal standards applicable to the State's submission.").

[34] *Branch*, 123 S.Ct. at 1435.

because Texas had no power to enact it once *Balderas* installed Plan 1151C.

We are not persuaded. First, we cannot agree that by passing § 2c, Congress revoked the authority granted states by the Elections Clause. To be sure, § 2c constrains the redistricting decisions that states can make, but it cannot fairly be said to revoke the states' power. Plaintiffs advance a specie of preemption argument: that by passing legislation that relates in some way to congressional districting, Congress has effectively usurped the entire redistricting field.

This interpretation of § 2c ignores the text of § 2c and misreads the Elections Clause. Section 2c has no language suggesting that Congress is "revoking" the authority granted by the Elections Clause, or even that Congress is "redelegating" a more limited authority. If Congress wishes to revoke the states' redistricting authority, it must do so clearly.[35] Moreover, Plaintiffs' argument tacitly assumes that any congressional regulation relating to election procedures automatically revokes the broad authority given states under the Elections Clause. The structure of the Clause, however, suggests that the primary source of election regulation is state law, federal law supplementing state procedures or overriding them only when necessary. Reading § 2c for what it is – a congressional

[35] To put the argument in slightly different terms, had the Framers intended to deprive states of authority to regulate whenever Congress spoke on the subject, they would surely have phrased the Elections Clause differently. For example, the Framers could have written: "The legislatures of the states may prescribe the time, places and manner of holding elections *until* Congress does so."

regulation imposing a single election requirement on the states – preserves the relative roles of Congress and the states under the Elections Clause.

Second, even if § 2c did somehow revoke and redelegate redistricting authority, we disagree that § 2c would allow redistricting only on the decennium. Plaintiffs base their argument on the text of § 2c, which provides in pertinent part:

> In each State entitled . . . to more than one Representative under an apportionment made pursuant to the provisions of section 2a(a) of this title [the decennial census], there shall be established by law a number of districts equal to the number of Representatives to which such State is so entitled, and Representatives shall be elected only from districts so established, no district to elect more than one Representative. . . . [36]

Plaintiffs argue that this provision directly links the "time" at which the state must redistrict to the "mode" in which it must exercise its redistricting power. That is, the clause requiring states to establish districts immediately follows the reference to the decennial census.[37] Plaintiffs also reference several other federal statutes imposing "time" and "manner" restrictions, apparently in an effort to bolster the notion that federal law restricts a state's ability to redistrict frequently.

---

[36] 2 U.S.C. § 2c (2003).

[37] Plaintiffs also cite to the Supreme Court's decision in *Utah v. Evans*, 536 U.S. 452, 461 (2002), presumably in an effort to bolster their linkage argument. *Evans*, however, does not discuss whether federal law limits the frequency with which a state can redistrict.

While it is true that states are under an obligation to redistrict after each census, we find nothing in § 2c that limits the frequency with which they may do so. It would have been remarkably easy for Congress to impose such a limitation in the text of § 2c, but it did not. It merely required states with more than one representative to divide their territory into a like number of districts.[38] Other courts have similarly failed to find such a limitation in § 2c. As we noted above, numerous courts have either allowed or invited state legislatures to enact redistricting plans in the middle of the decade when a court has previously imposed a plan.[39] Section 2c was in force when each of these decisions was handed down.

The final step in Plaintiffs' § 2c argument is similarly flawed. Plaintiffs conclude that *Balderas,* by establishing a constitutional redistricting plan, "used up" the state's constitutional authority to redistrict. Plaintiffs frame their argument by again focusing on the meaning of § 2c – which, they assert, reveals that court redistricting is constitutionally "equivalent" for purposes of Article I, Section 4 to state legislative redistricting.[40] We agree that

---

[38] Incidentally, there is no question that Plan 1374C complies with this requirement.

[39] *See supra* note 14 and accompanying text.

[40] To reach this conclusion, Plaintiffs first observe that § 2c is "just as binding" on the courts as it is on state legislatures. Second, when a federal court creates congressional districts under § 2c, it necessarily does so in the manner provided by state law. Finally, § 2c is a valid exercise of Congress's reserve power under the Elections Clause. Taken together, these three principles are said to prove that court-drawn districts are "functionally equivalent" to congressional districts drawn by state legislatures through the exercise of the power by Article I, Section 4, cl. 1.

court-drawn maps are functionally equivalent to legislative maps, although there are key differences between the two. But our agreement on this point is of little help to Plaintiffs because they fail to persuade that a state cannot redraw district lines after a valid court-imposed plan is in place. That is, *Balderas* could only "use up" the State's constitutional authority to redistrict if the state is somehow constrained to draw district lines only once per decade. We have rejected Plaintiffs' argument that redistricting following a judicially imposed plan is forbidden, and we do not reach Plaintiffs' *Balderas* claim.

D

Plaintiffs also assert that Texas "tradition" prevents the State Legislature from redrawing district lines in the middle of the decade. They argue that, under Supreme Court precedent, the State Legislature was bound to follow its traditional redistricting principles in creating a new map. Since Texas does not have either a history or tradition of mid-decade redistricting, Plan 1374C is said to be invalid.

Plaintiffs' argument misreads Supreme Court precedent. Although the Supreme Court has required *courts* to use a state's "districting traditions" when drafting voting maps, the Court has never held that a state *legislature* is bound to follow its prior districting practices indefinitely. Indeed, "tradition" normally fills a very different role in redistricting suits.[41] Plaintiffs cite two Supreme Court

[41] Initially, the Court used tradition as a lens through which charges of racial gerrymandering are analyzed. Thus, in *Easley v.*

(Continued on following page)

decisions, *White v. Weiser*[42] and *Branch v. Smith*,[43] to support their argument, but neither decision holds that states are bound to follow state tradition in drawing maps. In *White*, the Supreme Court held that *federal courts*, not state legislatures, must abide state districting traditions; the Court iterated that legislatures, not courts, have "primary jurisdiction" over reapportionment, and reinforced the notion that court intervention in the redistricting process is meant to be minor and remedial.[44] *Branch v. Smith* is also inapposite. In *Branch*, the Court attempted to reconcile § 2c with the seemingly conflicting requirements of § 2a(c)(5).[45] The Court explained that when a "federal court redistricts a State in a manner that complies with that State's substantive districting principles, it does so 'in the manner provided by the law thereof.'"[46] Plaintiffs cite this passage as evidence that states are constrained by tradition. Presumably, their argument is that since the Court held that a federal court redistricts

---

Cromartie, 532 U.S. 234 (2001), the Court reiterated that "that those who claim that a legislature has improperly used race as a criterion, in order, for example, to create a majority-minority district, must show at a minimum that the 'legislature subordinated traditional race-neutral districting principles . . . to racial considerations.'" 532 U.S. 234, 241 (2001) (quoting *Miller v. Johnson*, 515 U.S. 900, 928 (1995)).

[42] 412 U.S. 783 (1973).

[43] 123 S.Ct. 1429 (2003).

[44] *White*, 412 U.S. at 795.

[45] Section 2a(c)(5) requires that representatives shall be elected in at-large elections "[u]ntil a State is redistricted in the manner provided by the law thereof after any apportionment," whereas § 2c requires states to be divided into single-member districts and prohibits courts from ordering at-large elections. *See* 2 U.S.C. §§ 2a(c)(5), 2c.

[46] *Branch*, 123 S. Ct. at 1444 (citations omitted).

"in the manner provided by the law [of the state]" only when it follows the state's districting traditions, so too a state legislature can only redistrict "in the manner provided by the law [of the state]" when it follows the state's districting traditions. Plaintiffs misread this passage. *Branch* does not hold that a state must follow its redistricting traditions without deviation. Rather, the passage is focused solely on the power of federal courts. It specifically holds that if a federal court redistricts a state using the state's traditions and preferences, the court does so "in the manner provided by the law" of the state, such that § 2a(c)(5)'s requirement that at-large districts be used is not invoked.

In any event, it would be illogical to require a state legislature to adhere strictly to the state's districting principles whenever it undertook to redraw the state's map. Any such rule would, in effect, freeze the state's districting traditions in place.[47] We can find no reasoned basis for such a rule.[48]

---

[47] Technically, the state would be bound to follow whatever districting traditions were in force as of the passage of § 2c.

[48] As further evidence of Texas's districting "traditions," Plaintiffs assert that the Texas Constitution bars mid-decade redistricting. We have already rejected the notion that the Texas Legislature is limited by its own traditions; therefore, we need not address this constitutional assertion. However, even if Texas's own traditions did limit the Texas Legislature, Plaintiffs have shown this court nothing in the Texas Constitution that would limit mid-decade redistricting. The State has not questioned this court's authority to enforce state law against the State of Texas. Given our finding that state law is no prohibition to mid-decade redistricting, we have no occasion to face the jurisdictional issue sua sponte.

(Continued on following page)

The Texas Constitution does not explicitly allocate responsibility for drawing congressional districts. Plaintiffs point to this fact and argue that without an affirmative constitutional grant allowing the Legislature to undertake mid-decade redistricting, it may not do so. Plaintiffs' argument fails, however, precisely because the Texas Constitution is altogether silent on the topic of congressional redistricting. That is, not only does it not explicitly give the State Legislature the power to redistrict *mid-decade*; it does not explicitly give the State Legislature the power to draw congressional districts *at all*. Yet there is no doubt under Texas law that the State Legislature is in fact empowered to draw congressional district lines. The Texas Supreme Court reached this precise conclusion in *Perry v. Del Rio,* 67 S.W.3d 85, 91 (Tex. 2001), and numerous other courts have implicitly reached the same conclusion. It is well-established under Texas law that the Texas Legislature may legislate in any area not specifically proscribed by the Texas Constitution. Since the Texas Constitution does not deprive the Legislature of the power to pass congressional redistricting plans mid-decade, the Legislature has the power under Texas law to enact redistricting schemes intradecenially.

Although the Texas Constitution does not explicitly allocate the power to draw congressional districts, Article III, § 28 does address redistricting for state legislative districts. It requires the Texas Legislature to draw state representative and senatorial districts at its first regular session after the publication of the decennial census. If the Legislature fails to do so, § 28 confers the responsibility on a special body, the Legislative Redistricting Board.

Section 28 is generally thought to apply only to state legislative redistricting, but Plaintiffs assert that it applies to congressional redistricting as well, by analogy if not directly. Plaintiffs argue that § 28 prevents the Legislature from redrawing district lines mid-decade. For support, they point to a provision in the Texas Constitution of 1876 that limits the Texas Legislature to once-a-decade redistricting. While this provision was removed from the Constitution by an amendment to Article III, there is evidence that the 1876 provision remains in force.

The difficulty is that Plaintiffs ask us to do more than just apply Article III, § 28. They ask that we restore a provision removed over 100 years ago, apply it beyond its plain text to congressional redistricting, and strike down in the name of state law the first redistricting plan passed by the State Legislature since 1991. We are aware of no Texas case that has ever directly held that Article III, § 28 applies in full to

(Continued on following page)

E

Plaintiffs' final argument focuses on the effect of the *Balderas* judgment. They argue that *Balderas* was a final judgment that is binding on the State because it was a party to the proceeding. They argue that the State in enacting Plan 1374C is attempting to avoid the judgment in that case, and that the State is collaterally estopped from contesting the use of Plan 1151C.

The prerequisites for collateral estoppel are not met here. Issue preclusion has four basic requirements: (1) the issue must be identical to an issue involved in prior litigation; (2) the issue must have been fully and vigorously litigated; (3) the issue must have been necessarily decided in the prior litigation; and (4) special circumstances must not render preclusion inappropriate or unfair.[49] The first two requirements are not met here. It is true, as Plaintiffs argue, that the two majority-minority districts – Districts 18 and 30 – are involved in both cases, as are several other features of the two plans. But the *Balderas* court's tasks were different: it had to bring the district map into line with the equal population rule, while accommodating the two new congressional districts and obeying the Voting Rights Act. The issues are different

---

congressional redistricting; all Texas decisions of which we are aware have assumed that § 28 does not control. And the Texas Attorney General Opinion Letters that Plaintiffs cite to bolster their argument also do not opine that Article III, § 28 applies in full to congressional redistricting. The letters address the State's duties under Article III, § 28 without addressing the Legislature's power to draw congressional districts.

[49] *Winters v. Diamond Shamrock Chem. Co.*, 149 F.3d 387, 391 (5th Cir. 1998).

here. We must first decide whether the State has the constitutional power under the Elections Clause or § 2c to redraw district lines mid-decade. This issue did not arise in *Balderas*. We also must examine a never-before-considered legislative districting plan, Plan 1374C, and decide whether it passes muster under the Constitution and the Voting Rights Act. We find no merit in Plaintiffs' collateral estoppel argument.

F

Perhaps the most compelling arguments offered by Plaintiffs against mid-decade redistricting focus on the impropriety – rather than the illegality – of frequent redistricting. A significant portion of Plaintiffs' arguments raise policy concerns. For example, Plaintiffs argue that frequent redrawing of district lines will undermine democratic accountability and exact a heavy cost on state independence as federal congressional leaders exert their influence to shape state districting behavior.

As persuasive as these arguments may be, they are directed to the wrong forum. If Congress chooses to ban intradecennial redistricting, it has the power to do so under the Elections Clause. We have found no provision in either the U.S. Constitution, federal law, or state law that proscribes mid-decade redistricting, and our mandate ends there.

G

We deny Plaintiffs' Motions to Dismiss and Motions for Summary Judgment on the issue of mid-decade redistricting and collateral estoppel.

III

Turning to the merits, we will first consider Plaintiffs' claims in their two most sweeping forms. First, Plaintiffs argue that the proposed plan must be set aside in its entirety because it is laced with impermissible racial discrimination against Blacks and Latinos in violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the United States Constitution. Second, they allege that Plan 1374C is an impermissible partisan gerrymander. After addressing these allegations, we will then discuss a kindred but "analytically distinct claim" of racial discrimination under the Equal Protection Clause that in the drawing of various districts the Legislature was predominately motivated by race. We will reject the broad-based claims at the outset and return to these *Shaw* claims in our consideration of the more focused claims under § 2 leveled against specific districts. That process will amplify the findings that underpin our conclusion that Plaintiffs have failed to prove purposeful racial discrimination.

A

Since *Washington v. Davis*,[50] a claimed denial of Equal Protection has required proof that discrimination was purposeful; differential or adverse impact alone is not sufficient. In *Davis*, the Supreme Court considered an employment discrimination claim brought under the Equal Protection Clause in the District of Columbia before Title VII was extended to the District. Writing for the Court, Justice White rejected the argument that a party

[50] 426 U.S. 229 (1976).

alleging racial discrimination under the Equal Protection Clause could focus solely on the racially differential impact of the challenged state practice.[51] He explained that the Court had "never held that the constitutional standard for adjudicating claims of invidious racial discrimination [was] identical to the standards applicable under Title VII,"[52] which in certain circumstances allowed the adverse impact upon a protected minority to constitute sufficient proof of a statutory violation. He concluded that the Equal Protection Clause required more; it demanded proof that the challenged state action was intended to be discriminatory. *Davis* marked only the first step in the Court's analysis of Equal Protection claims, and in its wake came a range of questions, including questions about the allocations of the burden of proof and about the character of proof demanded by the requirement that racial discrimination be purposeful.

The next term, in *Arlington Heights v. Metropolitan Housing Corp.*,[53] the Court repudiated the Seventh Circuit's emphasis on the adverse impact of a challenged zoning decision in a Chicago suburb, rather than its purpose. Writing for the majority, Justice Powell – while acknowledging that proof of purpose would seldom be easy – explained that it was not necessary to prove that a decision was motivated by a single concern, or even that a particular purpose was the dominant or primary one. There need only be proof "that a discriminatory purpose

---

[51] *Id.* at 239.

[52] *Id.*

[53] 429 U.S. 252 (1977).

has been a motivating factor in the decision."[54] The inquiry, he explained, may start with the impact of the legislative act, which while not alone sufficient to prove purpose remains relevant, and continue to the exploration of the act's history, including any contemporary statements by members of the decision-making body.

Two years later in *Personnel Administrator of Mass. v. Feeney*,[55] the Court upheld a Massachusetts statute granting lifetime preferences to veterans for civil service positions. The Court rejected claims that because few women could qualify, the statute discriminated against women in violation of the Equal Protection Clause. Writing for the majority, Justice Stewart pointed to findings of the district court that the statute had a legitimate purpose – awarding benefits to veterans – and was not a pretext for discriminating against women. He then offered a critical observation, one that proved to be a powerful and enduring feature of Equal Protection Clause jurisprudence:

> It would [be] disingenuous to say that the adverse consequences of this legislation for women were unintended, in the sense that they were not volitional or in the sense that they were not foreseeable.
>
> "Discriminatory purpose," however, implies more than intent as volition or intent as awareness of consequences. It implies that the decision maker, in this case a state legislature, selected or reaffirmed a particular course of action at least

[54] *Id.* at 265-66.

[55] 442 U.S. 256 (1979).

> in part "because of," not merely "in spite of," its adverse effects upon an identifiable group.[56]

After grappling with the explicit remedial use of race by courts, legislative bodies, and various federal and state institutions, the Court turned to redistricting plans drawn to enhance the opportunity of minorities protected by the Voting Rights Act where race had become more than another of many necessary considerations in line-drawing. Justice Ginsberg put it succinctly in *Miller v. Johnson*:

> Two Terms ago, in *Shaw v. Reno,* this Court took up a claim "analytically distinct" from a vote dilution claim. *Shaw* authorized judicial intervention in "extremely irregular" apportionments, in which the legislature cast aside traditional districting practices to consider race alone – in the *Shaw* case, to create a district in North Carolina in which African-Americans would compose a majority of the voters.[57]

In short, *Miller* instructs that we are to engage in a searching review of district lines "predominantly motivated" by race when a state subordinates traditional districting practices to race.

---

[56] *Id.* at 278-79 (internal citations omitted); Justice Stewart went on to explain that the impact was relevant as in *Arlington Heights. Id.* at 279 n.24 ("Proof of discriminatory intent must necessarily usually rely on objective factors, several of which were outlined in *Arlington Heights v. Metropolitan Housing Dev. Corp.* The inquiry is practical. What a legislature or any official entity is 'up to' may be plain from the results its actions achieve, or the results they avoid. Often it is made clear from what has been called, in a different context, 'the give and take of the situation.'" (citations omitted)).

[57] *Miller v. Johnson,* 515 U.S. 930, 934 (1995) (Ginsburg, J., dissenting) (internal citations omitted).

Plaintiffs have not proven their claim of racial discrimination. There is little question but that the single-minded purpose of the Texas Legislature in enacting Plan 1374C was to gain partisan advantage. With the Republican sweep of statewide offices in 2000 came control of the Legislative Redistricting Board. The Legislature was initially unable to redraw district lines for either state legislative or congressional seats. The federal courts drew a congressional district plan[58] and after one modification held that the plans for the Texas House of Representatives and Senate drawn by the Republican-controlled Board were legal.[59] Although the judicial plan for the congressional districts reflected the growing strength of the Republican Party in Texas, with 20 of the 32 seats offering a Republican advantage, the voters in 2002 split their tickets and elected only 15 Republicans. Six incumbent Anglo Democrats were elected by narrow margins in Republican-leaning districts. With Republicans in control of the State Legislature, they set out to increase their representation in the congressional delegation to 22. As we will explain, all that happened thereafter flowed from this objective, with the give-and-take inherent in the legislative process along the way. The result disadvantaged

---

[58] *See Balderas v. Texas*, No. 6:01-CV-158, slip op. (E.D. Tex. Nov. 14, 2002), *aff'd mem.*, 536 U.S. 919 (2002).

[59] *See Balderas v. Texas*, No. 6:01-CV-158, slip op. (E.D. Tex. Nov. 28, 2001), *available at* 2001 WL 34104833; *Balderas v. Texas*, No. 6:01-CV-158, slip op. (E.D. Tex. Nov. 28, 2001), *available at* 2001 WL 34104836.

Democrats. And a high percentage of Blacks and Latinos are Democrats.[60]

The majority of Plaintiffs' Equal Protection claims focus on District 26 in Plan 1374C, which reflects Republican refusal to preserve Democratic Congressman Martin Frost's District 24 while at the same time preserving adjoining Republican districts. To remove Congressman Frost, he needed to lose a large portion of his Democratic constituency, many of whom lived in a predominantly Black area of Tarrant County. This group of voters was taken from previous District 24 and grouped with Denton and Cooke Counties, which are north of Tarrant County. Plaintiffs view the protrusion that reaches down to include the Black Democrats as evidence of intentional racial discrimination.

We disagree. That African-Americans in Texas vote overwhelmingly for Democratic candidates and that various political compromises were reached to arrive at the current district lines belie the assertion that Texas intentionally discriminated against the African-American voters. Bob Davis, who assisted the Texas Senate in drawing various plans and submitting them to the Legislative Redistricting Board, credibly testified as to the various political considerations that combined to result in the lines of current Congressional District 26. First, Representative Kent Grusendorf, who served on the House side of the districting committee, wanted his State House District – which covers the city of Arlington – to remain

---

[60] *See, e.g.*, Tr. 12/11 PM (Lichtman), at 67-68; Jackson Pls.' Exs. 1, 10, 12-13, and 15.

whole.[61] Arlington's western boundary forms most of the eastern edge of District 26's southern protrusion. Second, the court-drawn map, Plan 1151C, split State House Representative Glenn Lewis's District 95 into two different congressional districts. Representative Lewis wanted his district to fall completely within one congressional district.[62] House District 95 now forms the southern tip of Plan 1374C's District 26, explaining the southernmost boundaries of District 26. Third, Democrats could not be placed in Congressional District 12 to the west because District 12 would then become "far more Democrat and very marginally Republican, if Republican at all."[63] Finally, Representative Phil King, the chairman of the redistricting bill in the Texas House, wanted Parker and Wise Counties to be included completely in Congresswoman

---

[61] Tr. 12/18 AM (Davis), at 77. State Representative Phil King, the bill sponsor for redistricting on the House side, added: "my job was to get eight votes aye on the redistricting committee then 76 on the Floor and then six in the conference committee. And Kent Grusendorf had said that he – that he would not support any plan – he was on the redistricting committee – that did not keep the City of Arlington whole. He said Arlington always gets split up. He wanted it whole." Tr. 12/18 PM (King), at 135-36.

[62] Tr. 12/18 AM (Davis), at 78. Representative King reinforced Davis's testimony, stating: "I had also been directed by the Speaker of the House – Glenn Lewis, was the first Democrat and the first minority member to come out supporting him publicly for Speaker. And Glenn Lewis had asked the Speaker that his District not be divided up, but remain intact within a Congressional District, nonspecific as to which District, although he made it clear his preference was that it stay in a Martin Frost District. So I was directed by the Speaker of the House to under no circumstances split up Glenn Lewis's House seat, which is 95." Tr. 12/18 PM (King), at 136.

[63] Tr. 12/18 AM (Davis), at 79.

Granger's District 12.[64] But if the Tarrant County population fell in District 12, population would need to be taken out, likely from Parker or Wise counties.

> So, the net result was the political consequences of putting that territory, either in District 12 or District 6, were not good. And District 26, which was, in the Court Plan, this area in here, adjacent to it, and so it was placed on the District 26 because the political structure of 26 could handle that particular component of the Tarrant County population and still produce Republican results for District 26.[65]

We find these unchallenged explanations to be credible, and we find that including the large Democratic area of southeast Tarrant County in District 26 was the sole product of political give-and-take by legislative members over their own state districts and the effort to not create another Democratic district. The actions were not taken because of race; they were taken in spite of it.

Plaintiffs' expert's testimony supports our conclusion that politics, not race, drove Plan 1374C. The Jackson Plaintiffs' expert, Dr. John Alford, professor of political

---

[64] *Id.* at 79: 19-24.

[65] *Id.* at 80: 2-9. Representative King testified to the same political result: "[W]hat we did in Tarrant County, the only way we could do that is basically took Stop Six Poly and Handley and Meadowbrook area and all of that and moved it up into north and tied it in with the Denton County area. And those – we tried to, the best we could, maintain the city limit lines for Ft. Worth and for Arlington in that measure. And generally, you had that level of politics going on in every county, particularly the metropolitan ones throughout the State." Tr. 12/18 PM (King), at 137.

science at Rice University, testified that "one would have a very hard time not recognizing that the State has a very strong partisan motivation in this particular map."[66] Representative Phil King testified that the purpose of the plan was to make the congressional delegation more reflective of state voting trends. The amicus brief of the Texas House Democratic Caucus and Representatives John Lewis, Chris Bell, Martin Frost, Sheila Jackson Lee, and Nick Lampson filed in *Vieth v. Jubelirer* in support of Appellants told the Supreme Court that "[t]he newly dominant Republicans . . . decided to redraw the state's congressional districts solely for the purpose of seizing between five and seven seats from Democratic incumbents." It was clear from the evidence that this assertion is true. Former Lieutenant Governor Bill Ratliff, one of the most highly regarded members of the Senate and commonly referred to as the conscience of the Senate, testified that political gain for the Republicans was 110% of the motivation for the Plan, that it was "the entire motivation."[67] He explained that he is leaving the Senate before the expiration of his term in large part out of disappointment at its partisan turn. In the course of the redistricting bill's passage, Senator Ratliff, a Republican, refused to abandon the two-thirds rule, which does not allow a bill to come to the floor without the support of 21 members, a practice calculated to promote consensus building.

Plaintiffs nonetheless insist that there was racial discrimination along the way in the specific drawing of the

---

[66] Tr. 12/15 AM (Alford), at 109.

[67] Tr. 12/15 AM (Ratliff), at 35.

lines. We will examine this less sweeping assertion as we examine the particular districts that are alleged to have been drawn in violation of § 2 of the Voting Rights Act, or in defiance of the principles of *Shaw v. Reno*.

While keenly aware of the long history of discrimination against Latinos and Blacks in Texas, and recognizing that their long struggle for economic and personal freedom is not over, we are compelled to conclude that this plan was a political product from start to finish. The myriad decisions made during its creation were made in spite of, and not because of, its effects upon Blacks and Latinos. To find otherwise would frustrate the fundamentals of *Washington v. Davis* and inject the federal courts into a political game for which they are ill-suited, and indeed in which they are charged not to participate under the most basic principles of federalism and separation of power. Concluding that the purpose requirement of the Equal Protection Clause was met on these facts would pass redistricting from the state legislatures and redistricting boards to the federal courts. This is not to say that we wholly withdraw, of course. We simply recognize the fundamental decision in *Washington v. Davis* that federal judges are not legislative players; we are only the guardians of the boundaries. As Justice Ginsburg put it, while "[l]egislative districting is highly political business . . . [g]enerations of rank discrimination against [minorities] account for [the court's] surveillance."[68]

---

[68] *Miller v. Johnson*, 515 U.S. 930, 934 (1995) (Ginsburg, J., dissenting).

Having been watchful, we are not persuaded that this most fundamental boundary of the Equal Protection Clause was crossed. In the redistricting arena, an area that has proven most reluctant to yield discernible standards, there are large incentives to reach for the seeming certainty of the Equal Protection Clause's familiar condemnation of purposeful racial discrimination and draw upon its comforting moral force, rather than confront the task of developing proper standards or concede their ephemeral political character. To our eyes, the certainty is an illusion, and its deployment to heel radical partisan line-drawing by state legislatures is a mistake. And turning to *Washington v. Davis*'s insistence of purpose, rather than confronting directly the questions now before the Court in *Vieth v. Jubelirer,* is just an old Texas two-step.[69]

B

We have no hesitation in concluding that, under current law, this court cannot strike down Plan 1374C on

---

[69] The Appellants in *Vieth v. Jubelirer* note the problems resulting from litigants turning to race-based claims when they have no chance of proving a *Bandemer* claim: "[W]ith no prospect of prevailing on a forthright claim of partisan gerrymandering under the lower courts' interpretation of *Bandemer*, aggrieved partisans instead often allege racial gerrymandering or minority vote dilution in violation of the Voting Rights Act. The incentive to couch partisan disputes in racial terms bleeds back into the legislative process, too, as members of the 'out' party – believing they can win only in court, and only on a race-based claim – may be tempted to spice the legislative record with all manner of racialized arguments, to lay the foundation for an eventual court challenge." Brief for Appellant at 10-11, *Vieth v. Jubelirer,* 2003 WL 22070244 (2003) (internal citations and footnotes omitted).

the basis that it is an illegal partisan gerrymander. Seventeen years ago, the Supreme Court held in *Davis v. Bandemer*[70] that an excessively political or partisan gerrymander presents a justiciable issue under the Equal Protection Clause. But the Court was unable to settle upon a manageable standard for addressing such claims. It is now painfully clear that Justice Powell's concern that the decision offered a "'constitutional green light' to would-be gerrymanderers" has been realized.[71] *Bandemer* insisted upon proof of both discriminatory purpose and discriminatory effect, two requirements that are difficult to meet in the courtroom, particularly as they have been interpreted by the lower courts. That the response to this difficulty must be to develop a new standard does not necessarily follow. The question remains how much of a role the judiciary ought to play in policing the political give-and-take of redistricting. It may be the most difficult question, but it is certainly the most important.

When the Supreme Court resolves *Vieth,* it may choose to retreat from its decision that the question is justiciable, or it may offer more guidance on the nature of the required effect. Perhaps the Court will draw on its experience in developing federal common law in the antitrust arena, which draws a fine line between competitive effect and injury to competition.[72] We have learned firsthand what will result if the Court chooses to do

---

[70] 478 U.S. 109 (1986).

[71] *Id.* at 173 (Powell, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part).

[72] Professor Samuel Issacharoff has explored this idea in a recent article. *See* Samuel Issacharoff, *Gerrymandering and Political Cartels,* 116 HARV. L. REV. 593 (2002).

neither. Throughout this case we have borne witness to the powerful, conflicting forces nurtured by *Bandemer*'s holding that the judiciary is to address "excessive" partisan line-drawing, while leaving the issue virtually unenforceable. Inevitably, as the political party in power uses district lines to lock in its present advantage, the party out of power attempts to stretch the protective cover of the Voting Rights Act, urging dilution of critical standards that may, if accepted, aid their party in the short-run but work to the detriment of persons now protected by the Act in the long-run. Casting the appearance both that there is a wrong and that the judiciary stands ready with a remedy, *Bandemer* as applied steps on legislative incentives for self-correction.

There are ameliorations available short of a grand judicial pronouncement, remedies which are perhaps superior. In Texas, redistricting advantages can be overcome through the political process. The exchange of political advantage between the Democrats in 1990 and the Republicans in 2000 demonstrates this reality. If the Democratic party takes the main statewide offices, Democrats can block a state legislative redistricting plan and write their own through the Legislative Redistricting Board. The resulting State Legislature could then redraw the congressional lines.

Even if the partisan gerrymander issue were not justiciable but Congress allowed the drawing of new lines only when there was no extant legal plan, and in any event no more often than once in a decade, the picture would likely be quite different. That the limitation would only reach congressional seats and not state legislatures themselves does not mean that its effects would not be larger. As the record in this case makes clear, Congress

often plays a large role in state redistricting, not only of congressional districts but also of the state chambers themselves. Members of Congress work to protect their incumbency and to affect the partisan makeup of the House, with keen interest in the election of members of the State Legislature. Accordingly, a rule that the game is played only once per decade could matter a great deal in the real world of politics. It is fair to ask what if Congress had imposed a once-a-decade rule seventeen years ago, even if *Bandemer* had dismissed the case as presenting a non-justiciable political question.

Our point is that if the judiciary must rein in partisan gerrymanders, limitations that focus upon the time and circumstance of partisan line-drawing and less upon the "some but not too much" genre of strictures offer the best of an ugly array of choices. Drawing upon the Voting Rights Act jurisprudence to give *Bandemer* teeth may be the worst of choices.

IV

For convenience, we record some of the general principles to which we will refer in addressing Plaintiffs' challenges to specific districts. Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (as amended) provides:

> (a) No voting qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure shall be imposed or applied by any State or political subdivision in a manner which results in a denial or abridgement of the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race or color, or in contravention of the guarantees set fort in section 1973b(f)(2) of this title, as provided in subsection (b) of this section.

> (b) A violation of subsection (a) of this section is established if, based on the totality of the circumstances, it is shown that the political processes leading to nomination or election in the State or political subdivision are not equally open to participation by members of a class of citizens protected by subsection (a) of this section in that its members have less opportunity than other members of the electorate to participate in the political process and elect representatives of their choice. The extent to which members of a protected class have been elected to office in the State or political subdivision is one circumstance which may be considered: Provided, That nothing in this section establishes a right to have members of a protected class elected in numbers equal to their proportion in the population.[73]

To prevail on a claim of vote dilution under § 2, a plaintiff must, as a threshold requirement, satisfy the three now-familiar preconditions set forth in *Thornburg v. Gingles*: (1) a minority group must be "sufficiently large and geographically compact to constitute a majority in a single-member district"; (2) the group must be "politically cohesive"; and (3) sufficient racial bloc voting must exist such that the white majority usually defeats the minority's preferred candidate.[74] *Gingles* withheld deciding whether

---

[73] 42 U.S.C. § 1973.

[74] *Thornburg v. Gingles*, 478 U.S. 30, 50-51 (1986). To aid courts in investigating a plaintiff's § 2 claim, the *Gingles* Court identified other factors that may, in "the totality of the circumstances," support a claim of racial vote dilution. Derived from the Senate Report accompanying the 1982 amendment to § 2, those factors include:

> 1. the extent of any history of official discrimination in the state or political subdivision that touched the right of

(Continued on following page)

there could ever be a showing of potential success without a showing that a clear majority could gather in the absence of the accused practice or structure. The lower courts, with the exception of a recent decision by a divided

---

the members of the minority group to register, to vote, or otherwise to participate in the democratic process;

2. The extent to which voting in the elections of the state or political subdivision is racially polarized;

3. the extent to which the state or political subdivision has used unusually large election districts, majority vote requirements, anti-single shot provisions, or other voting practices or procedures that may enhance the opportunity for discrimination against the minority group;

4. if there is a candidate slating process, whether the members of the minority group have been denied access to that process;

5. the extent to which members of the minority group in the state or political subdivision bear the effects of discrimination in such areas as education, employment and health, which hinder their ability to participate effectively in the political process;

6. whether political campaigns have been characterized by overt or subtle racial appeals; and

7. the extent to which members of the minority group have been elected to public office in the jurisdiction.

Additional factors that may be probative of vote dilution in some cases are:

8. whether there is a significant lack of responsiveness on the part of elected officials to the particularized needs of the members of the minority group; and

9. whether the policy underlying the state or political subdivision's use of such voting qualification, prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice or procedure is tenuous.

Id. at 37 (quoting S.Rep. No. 97-417, 97th Cong., 2nd Sess., at 28-29 (1982), reprinted in U.S. Code Cong. & Admin. News 1982, at 206-07).

panel of the First Circuit,[75] have strictly enforced the 50% rule, including the Fifth Circuit.[76] There are powerful reasons to be exacting, as we will explain, but the facts of this case offer no occasion to decide if there is a tolerable deviation from the rule that a minority must demonstrate that, absent an accused practice or structure, it had the potential to elect a candidate of its choice by proof that it could constitute 50% of the district.

Although satisfying the *Gingles* factors is a prerequisite, meeting the three conditions is alone not enough to prevail under § 2. If they are met, the court is to consider the totality of the circumstances, including a searching inquiry into whether the political process is equally open to minority voters. In *Johnson v. De Grandy*, the Court explained how to evaluate dilution under a single-member districting plan and discussed the extent of a state's duty to create additional majority-minority districts under § 2.[77] In *De Grandy*, the plaintiffs attempted to establish liability by pointing to a number of places where minority voters had been "cracked" and placed in majority-white districts where their votes would be "submerged" and ineffective. The Court rejected the dilution claim of the

---

[75] *See Metts v. Murphy*, 347 F.3d 346 (1st Cir. 2003). We note, however, that the First Circuit elected to take *Metts* en banc and issued an order expressly withdrawing and vacating the panel decision. *See Metts v. Murphy*, No. 02-2204 (1st Cir. Dec. 3, 2003) (order granting petition for rehearing en banc).

[76] *See, e.g., Valdespino v. Alamo Heights Ind. School Dist.*, 168 F.3d 848, 852-53 (5th Cir. 1999), *cert. denied*, 528 U.S. 1114 (2000); *Cousin v. Sundquist*, 145 F.3d 818, 827-29 (6th Cir. 1998); *Colleton County Council v. McConnell*, 201 F. Supp. 2d 618, 643 (D.S.C. 2002).

[77] 512 U.S. 997 (1994).

Hispanic and African-American voters because the challenged districting plan provided both sets of voters "rough proportionality," the opportunity to exercise electoral control in a number of districts that roughly corresponded to their share of the relevant population.[78] The Court emphasized that proportionality does not provide a complete or mechanical defense to a § 2 suit.[79] The Court also made it clear that proportionality is significant in evaluating dilution claims and has become a preeminent measure of fairness in redistricting.[80] Now known as "*De Grandy* proportionality," dilution may be found to be absent under the totality of the circumstances when the protected minority groups "constitute effective voting majorities in a number of districts . . . substantially proportional to their share in the population."[81]

In *Shaw v. Reno* ("Shaw I"), the Court addressed the constitutionality of a district drawn with race as the predominant motivation, as evidenced by a bizarrely-shaped

---

[78] *Id.* at 1015-16.

[79] *Id.* at 1018-19, 1023-24; *see also, Barnett v. City of Chicago,* 141 F.3d 699, 705 (7th Cir. 1998); J. Gerald Hebert, *Redistricting in the Post-2000 Era,* 8 GEO. MASON L. REV. 431 (2000) ("As a practical matter, . . . one factor is particularly important: the 'proportionality,' or lack thereof, between the number of minority-controlled districts and the minority's share of the state's relevant population.").

[80] A redistricting plan may, of course, achieve proportionality and yet violate § 2. *See, e.g., Rural West Tennessee African-American Affairs Council v. Sundquist,* 209 F.3d 835 (6th Cir. 2000); *Harvell v. Blytheville Sch. Dist. No. 5,* 126 F.3d 1038 (8th Cir. 1997); *Harvell v. Blytheville Sch. Dist. No. 5,* 71 F.3d 1382 (8th Cir. 1995); *Little Rock Sch. Dist. v. Pulaski County Special Sch. Dist., #1,* 56 F.3d 904 (8th Cir. 1995); *Barnett v. Daley,* 32 F.3d 1196 (7th Cir. 1994).

[81] *De Grandy,* 512 U.S. at 1020.

district drawn to augment minority voting strength.[82] The Court held that such a district could be challenged, depending on how it was drawn, under the Equal Protection Clause. In *Shaw v. Hunt* ("Shaw II"), the Court concluded that a racially gerrymandered district would be subject to strict scrutiny, and that compliance with § 2 could justify a racially gerrymandered district only if the remedial district was narrowly tailored toward that end.[83] In so holding, the Court held that a remedy for vote dilution in one part of the state, where it was possible to draw an additional, compact majority-minority district, is not narrowly tailored to comply with § 2 if the remedial district is drawn in a different part of the state where polarized voting also exists, but where a compact district cannot be crafted. In so holding, the Court stated:

> Arguing, as appellees do and the District Court did, that the State may draw the district anywhere derives from a misconception of the vote-dilution claim. To accept that the district may be placed anywhere implies that the claim, and hence the coordinate right to an undiluted vote (to cast a ballot equal among voters), belongs to the minority as a group and not to its individual members. It does not.[84]

Similarly, in *De Grandy,* the Court stated that one reason for rejecting the inflexible safe harbor rule the state advocated in that case, under which no dilution can occur as a matter of law if the percentage of single member

---

[82] 509 U.S. 630 (1993).

[83] 517 U.S. 899 (1996).

[84] *Id.* at 917.

districts in which minority voters form an effective majority mirrors the minority voters' percentage of the relevant population, was that it rested on

> an unexplored premise of highly suspect validity: that in any given voting jurisdiction (or portion of that jurisdiction under consideration), the rights of some minority voters under § 2 may be traded off against the rights of other members of the same minority class. Under the State's view, the most blatant racial gerrymandering in half of a county's single-member districts would be irrelevant under § 2 if offset by political gerrymandering in the other half, so long as proportionality was the bottom line.[85]

With these basic principles in mind, we now turn to Plaintiffs' specific claims.

V

We first examine the § 2 challenges to the districts in Central and East Texas, most notably District 24 in the Dallas-Fort Worth area. As a preliminary matter, it bears emphasis that the majority requirement of the first *Gingles* precondition cannot be met in these districts by summing Black and Hispanic voter populations.[86] Plaintiffs cite *Brewer v. Ham*[87] for the proposition that minority groups may be combined to satisfy *Gingles*'s majority

---

[85] *De Grandy*, 512 U.S. at 1019.

[86] *Valdespino v. Alamo Heights Ind. Sch. Dist.*, 168 F.3d 848, 852-53 (5th Cir. 1999), *cert. denied*, 528 U.S. 1114 (2000).

[87] 876 F.2d 448, 453 (5th Cir. 1989).

requirement. *Brewer,* however, allowed for minority combination when the groups vote cohesively. Here, there is no serious dispute but that Blacks and Hispanics do not vote cohesively in primary elections, where their allegiance is free of party affiliation.[88] Minority voters must have the potential to elect in the absence of the accused practice or structure if their claim of injury by that practice or structure is to be sustained.[89]

A

1

Georgia v. Ashcroft[90] is the most recent discussion of the factual and legal distinctions between majority-minority, coalition, and influence districts.[91] Majority-minority or "safe" districts are voting districts with a majority of minority voters, making it "highly likely that minority voters will be able to elect the candidate of their choice."[92] Coalition districts are voting districts where minority voters "'are able to form coalitions with voters from other racial and ethnic groups, having no need to be

---

[88] *See* Post-Trial Brief of Jackson Plaintiffs, at 39 (conceding that "African-American and Hispanics in the Metroplex are not consistently 'jointly' cohesive in Democratic primaries"). Furthermore, even assuming that Blacks and Hispanics vote cohesively, Plaintiffs have failed to meet their burden to disprove partisanship as the driving force behind the bloc voting. *See LULAC v. Clements,* 999 F.2d 831, 850 (1993) (en banc).

[89] *Gingles,* 478 U.S. at 51 n.17.

[90] 123 S.Ct. 2498 (2003).

[91] The parties assign various names to these districts, but we will follow the Supreme Court's taxonomy.

[92] *Ashcroft,* 123 S.Ct. at 2511.

a majority within a single district in order to elect candidates of their choice.'"[93] Influence districts are voting districts "where minority voters may not be able to elect a candidate of choice but can play a substantial, if not decisive, role in the electoral process."[94] The elected representatives in influence districts, as a result of the influence of minority voting, take minority interests into account.[95]

Georgia tested the limits of these types of districts when it redrew its state senate's voting districts following the 2000 census. The previous map, which was finally precleared after much litigation, included various safe districts. Shifting its strategy, the Democratic-controlled Legislature "unpacked" three of the safe districts and spread the minority voters to create influence and coalition districts.[96] The goal was to increase the overall influence of minorities in Georgia politics. The Justice Department challenged the plan as retrogressive because of the reduction of minorities in the previously safe districts. The district court found the plan retrogressive because the change in the three safe districts created less opportunity for minorities to elect the representatives of their choice.

---

[93] *Id.* at 2512 (quoting *De Grandy,* 512 U.S. at 1020).

[94] *Id.*

[95] *Id.*

[96] *Id.* at 2507-08. The districts reduced the minority populations from 60.58%, 55.43%, and 62.45% to 50.31%, 50.66%, and 50.80%, respectively.

Georgia appealed the decision to the Supreme Court, arguing that preclearance was appropriate because the new map did not harm the minorities' "effective exercise of the electoral franchise." Georgia asked the Court to examine the voting plan as a whole so that the increase in voting strength in other influence and coalition districts could offset the decrease in the three previously safe districts. The Justice Department argued that the district court correctly found retrogression based solely on the decrease in minority population in the three previously safe districts.

Georgia's argument prevailed. The Court held that states are free to choose the best way to avoid retrogression and ensure equal opportunity to minority voters. To determine whether a new map is retrogressive, the Court examined the state as a whole and considered all the relevant circumstances, "such as the ability of minority voters to elect their candidate of choice, the extent of the minority group's opportunity to participate in the political process, and the feasibility of creating a nonretrogressive plan."[97] The Court accepted that minority interests may be better served by coalition and influence districts rather than safe districts. The Court noted that although safe districts ensure descriptive representation, they also "isolat[e] minority voters from the rest of the state, and risk[] narrowing political influence to only a fraction of political districts"[98] – that "various studies have suggested that the most effective way to maximize minority voting

[97] *Id.* at 2511.

[98] *Id.* at 2512.

strength may be to create more influence or coalitional districts,"[99] and, critically, Georgia may make that choice. Georgia's alteration of its safe districts would have been problematic at best in the 1980s and early 1990s, but the Court allowed it as a valid political choice that Georgia might choose to make in an effort to increase minority voting strength – an alternative to its obligation under *Gingles* to draw a safe majority-minority district.

The Court held that the district court erred in focusing too heavily on the decrease of voting power in the previously safe districts, and in ignoring the offsetting influence and coalition districts. In the Court's view, the ability of minorities to elect their preferred candidates is important, but not dispositive. Despite the views of the Justice Department, the ACLU, and lower federal courts, the Court held that creating safe districts was not the only means of assuring an effective vote for minorities.

While *Ashcroft* is a § 5 preclearance case addressing the question of retrogression, the Court's opinion makes plain that safe districts are no longer untouchable. States previously read *Gingles* as requiring safe districts to ensure the election of minorities by countering racially polarized voting. But *Georgia v. Ashcroft* makes clear that safe districts are not necessarily required; states may choose to avoid retrogression by creating coalition and influence districts. Georgia decreased the percentage of minority voters in three previously safe districts to such a degree that, in the opinion of the Justice Department, minorities could not elect their candidate of choices. Yet,

---

[99] *Id.* at 2513.

the addition of coalition and influence districts countered possible retrogression.

2

All parties here rely upon *Georgia v. Ashcroft*. Plaintiffs argue that *Ashcroft* effectively overruled *Gingles*'s first requirement that "the minority group must be able to demonstrate that it is sufficiently large and geographically compact to constitute a majority in a single-member district."[100] Plaintiffs base this assertion on *Ashcroft*'s reasoning that a district may provide effective representation to minorities despite the absence of a mathematical majority.[101] From this, Plaintiffs conclude that influence districts must be protected under § 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

In response, Texas argues that under *Ashcroft* redrawing an influence district does not inevitably dilute minority votes under § 2. Texas argues that if majority-minority districts may be altered without running afoul of the Voting Rights Act, then *a fortiori* an influence district may be altered. *Ashcroft* provided states with the flexibility to choose the means of complying with the Voting Rights Act, and although the Court opined that coalition and influence districts may be the most effective means of increasing minority influence, they are not required. *Ashcroft* did not dictate that a state must maximize both majority-minority and influence districts. Indeed, the question whether federal law requires influence districts has been avoided many

[100] *Gingles*, 478 U.S. at 50.

[101] *See* Post-Trial Brief of Jackson Plaintiffs, at 5 n.3.

times,[102] reflecting, the State argues, the Court's wariness of being drawn further into the political arena. Finally, the State notes that the Supreme Court faced the exact question and rejected it when it summarily affirmed a district court's rejection of the contention "that the first *Gingles* precondition is not fully applicable" to districts "where a distinct [minority] group cannot form a majority, but they are sufficiently large and cohesive to effectively influence elections, getting their candidate of choice elected."[103]

Texas's argument finds support in the language of *Ashcroft*:

> On one hand, a smaller number of safe majority-minority districts may virtually guarantee the election of a minority group's preferred candidate in those districts. . . . And while such districts may result in more "descriptive representation" because the representatives of choice are more likely to mirror the race of the majority of voters in that district, the representation may be limited to fewer areas.
>
> On the other hand, spreading out minority voters over a greater number of districts creates more districts in which minority voters may have the opportunity to elect a candidate of their choice. Such a strategy has the potential to increase "substantive representation" in more districts, by creating coalitions of voters who

---

[102] *See Uno v. City of Holyoke*, 72 F.3d 973, 979 n.2 (1st Cir. 1995); *Rural West Tenn. African-Am. Affairs Council, Inc. v. McWherter*, 877 F.Supp. 1096, 1101 (W.D. Tenn. 1995).

[103] *Parker v. Ohio*, 263 F. Supp. 2d 1100, 1104 (S.D. Ohio) (three-judge panel), *aff'd*, 124 S. Ct. 574 (2003).

> together will help to achieve the electoral aspirations of the minority group. It also, however, creates the risk that the minority group's preferred candidate may lose. . . . Section 5 gives States the flexibility to choose one theory of effective representation over the other.[104]

As we see it, these choices are for the states to make, as long as they avoid other constitutional and statutory violations under the Equal Protection Clause and § 2. Allowing influence districts to meet a *Gingles*-imposed obligation to create a majority-minority district does not mean that a state must create an influence district in the absence of an obligation to create a majority-minority district. We are not persuaded that Texas had the duty in drawing a new map to trace the old lines to avoid any disruption of coalitions. To so conclude would have profound consequences, freezing ephemeral political alliances, which are the bull's eyes of partisan redistricting. We will turn to a concrete example. The 24th is a Democratic district, and its "coalitions" are simply minority Blacks joining with majority Anglos voting a Democratic ticket in the general election. Plaintiffs' understandable efforts to freeze this "coalition" by locating some duty under § 2 not to redraw the district is a transparent effort to use race as a shield from a partisan gerrymander when the district itself was a child of identical efforts to gerrymander. As we will explain, under the new plan, Democrats – both Anglo and Black – lose control of the District 24.

---

[104] *Ashcroft*, 123 S.Ct. at 2512 (internal citations omitted).

B

We turn first to District 24, located in the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex in an area referred to as the mid-cities. The congressman from the district is Martin Frost, an Anglo Democrat elected in 1978. This area between Dallas and Fort Worth experienced enormous growth from the early 1960's, leading to the creation of the 24th in 1972. With some iteration, the district has remained in place until the passage of Plan 1374C in 2003. The old 24th touched both Dallas and Fort Worth and included the communities of Duncanville and Cedar Hill on its south side. It also included large plants of Bell Helicopter, General Motors, Northrop Grumman, and Lockheed Martin, as well as the Texas Rangers' baseball stadium and the Six Flags Over Texas theme park.[105]

Frost, then thirty-two years old, ran for the seat two years after it was created but was defeated in the Democratic primary by Dale Milford, the Anglo incumbent. Congressman Frost won the next race and has held the seat since then. Allied with Speaker Wright of Fort Worth, he quickly won leadership positions, including a seat on the Rules Committee. Frost is a major fund raiser for the Democratic party, and he so effectively chaired a redistricting panel in 1991 that he is widely seen as the architect of the redistricting plan of 1991.[106] This plan, drawing on the developing computer technology, is cited by political

---

[105] MICHAEL BARONE, THE ALMANAC OF AMERICAN POLITICS 2004, at 1580 (Nat'l Journal Group 2003).

[106] *Id.* at 1581.

scientists as the shrewdest of the 1990s.[107] Congresswoman Eddie Bernice Johnson, who holds a seat in an adjacent largely Black district, testified that Frost drew the 24th for an Anglo Democrat.[108]

The judicial plan replaced by 1374C left the 24th largely in place. It had a Black voting age population of 21.4% and a Hispanic voting age population of 33.6%. The latter number falls when citizenship (CVAP) is considered, as it must be. The result is that neither Blacks nor Hispanics have 50% of the voters in the district alone or combined, where they constitute only 46.4%. Measured by the statewide races and the Lieutenant Governor's race in 2002, District 24 is approximately 60% Democrat, although Al Gore carried the district with 54% of the vote and Governor Bush carried the entire state with 59% of the statewide vote and 61% in the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex. It bears mention that Houston and Dallas-Fort Worth cast 47% of all votes cast in the state.[109] Bush carried only 5% of the Black vote but enjoyed 42% of the Hispanic vote and 73% of the Anglo vote.[110]

Facing the absence of a minority with 50% of the voting age population of the district singly or combined, Plaintiffs contend that the 24th nonetheless meets the first two preconditions of *Gingles* because it "functions as a

---

[107] *Id.* at 1448 ("The plan carefully constructs democratic districts with incredibly convoluted lines and packs heavily Republican suburban areas into just a few districts.").

[108] Tr. 12/17 PM (Johnson), at 154-155, 161, 164-165.

[109] BARONE, supra note 105, at 1508.

[110] *Id.* at 1510.

fully effective Black opportunity district." They offer three reasons why we should not adhere to *Perez v. Pasadena Independent School District*[111] and *Valdespino v. Alamo Heights Independent School District*,[112] which hold that *Gingles* requires a cohesive group of minority voters comprising a majority of the adult citizen population in at least one proposed single-member demonstration district. First, insisting on a level of 50% is reasonable only when the court is asked to speculate on the potential performance of a minority district, not when an existing district is shown to actually perform for minorities. Second, Plaintiffs point to a divided decision issued only weeks ago by a panel of the First Circuit, *Metts v. Murphy,* which dispensed with the 50% rule. The panel's decision, we note, was expressly withdrawn and vacated when the First Circuit voted to take the case en banc.[113] Third, *Perez* and *Valdespino* involved challenges to non-partisan at-large election systems involving only single elections; here, we examine a single-member districting system with primary and general elections. Plaintiffs assert that if a minority can "control" the primary election and then find support with a coalition of minorities in the general election, the *Gingles* requirements are met and the district cannot be modified. Plaintiffs also offer a fourth, seemingly free-standing principle, urging that in any event District 24 cannot be intentionally dismantled because it is an influence or coalition district.

---

[111] 165 F.3d 368 (5th Cir. 1999), *cert. denied,* 528 U.S. 1114 (2000).

[112] 168 F.3d 848 (5th Cir. 1999), *cert. denied,* 528 U.S. 1114 (2000).

[113] 347 F.3d 346 (1st Cir. 2003), *vacated and reh'g en banc granted,* No. 02-2204 (1st Cir. Dec. 3, 2003).

Defendants respond that § 2 requires a showing of strength at a level of at least 50% is a command of § 2, a requirement that is an inevitable byproduct of the statute's protection of the ability of minorities to elect representatives of their choice. A minority group lacking a majority cannot elect its candidate of choice, and denying the group a separate district cannot be a denial of any opportunity protected by the Act. Rather, such a group can elect their candidate of choice only with the votes of non-majorities through coalitions, but the Voting Rights Act does not protect such political coalitions. Defendants urge that whether a minority can meet the 50% standard is a quite different question from asking "whether a bi-racial coalition of African Americans and 'crossover' Anglos can elect a Black-preferred Black candidate. Any such interpretation would render the first *Gingles* precondition an entirely superfluous subpart of the third *Gingles* precondition." Defendants argue further that the Supreme Court has never held that § 2 protects influence districts and such a proposal is foreclosed by the rationale of *Georgia v. Ashcroft*. Finally, defendants reply that there has been no showing that the 24th would probably elect a Black candidate, pointing to Congressional District 25 in the judicial Plan 1151C in which the demographics are strikingly similar – 21.4% BVAP and 33.6% HVAP – where an Anglo, Bell, defeated Carroll Robinson, the Black candidate of choice, in the 2002 Democratic primary.

Plaintiffs' arguments are creative, but they ask this court to do more than well-settled law will allow. To the heart of the matter: the contention that § 2 protects District 24 from redrawing asks us to extend § 2's protection of Blacks and Latinos from vote dilution to the protection of groups whose cementing force is membership and

loyalty to a political party. *Gingles* and the cases that followed it have been keenly aware that the defining concepts of *Gingles* – numbers and cohesion – are critical to its studied effort to confine the limits of the Act to those situations that dilute minorities' opportunity to vote without protecting coalitions that may be helpful or even essential to the leveraging of their strength.[114] Properly confined, the Act implements the fundamentals of factions. Unconfined it reaches into the political market and supports

---

[114] Dr. Keith Gaddie credibly testified that Plaintiffs' view of influence districts "would lock in a majority of seats for the party getting the minority of the vote." Deposition of Keith Gaddie, November 22, 2003, at 101. Further, he testified that it was not protected under § 2 and that it was not possible to draw a second, sufficiently compact majority-minority district in Dallas. *Id.* at 75 ("[District 24] is not going to meet the first prong of the *Gingles* criteria. . . . It is not a district in which you have one minority group which can constitute a majority of the population. It's not a district where that minority group controls primary and the general election. It's not possible to draw a second sufficiently compact majority district in Dallas if you draw District 30."). Accordingly, if § 2 protection is afforded to old District 24 despite the absence of the *Gingles* factors, the Voting Rights Act begins to protect political affiliation and not race. If the Voting Rights Act protects a district where coalitions are required to elect a candidate of choice –

> you're on a slippery slope to essentially saying, "Well, if it's a Democratic district, you can't re-draw it." And intellectually, that to me is troubling because it sets up a circumstance where one party has its constituency protected under the Voting Rights Act and . . . the other party doesn't have any protections at all.

Id. at 100. Protecting districts that are defined and controlled by political coalition and not race would infringe on the clear right of the state to choose its method of compliance with the Voting Rights Act. If there is no obligation to create an influence district, there is no obligation to retain one.

persons joined, not by race, but by common view. Serious constitutional questions loom at that juncture.

We are told that Blacks control the Democratic primary with less than 22% of the CVAP because Anglos and Latinos vote either in the Republican primary or not at all, but return home out of party loyalty in the general election. It is argued that this is a Black opportunity district. More accurately, however, it is a strong Democratic district. That there is no cohesion between Black and Latino voters in the primary contests is beyond serious dispute. Black opportunity here lies in coalitions with Anglos who vote with them in the general election for Democrats. Dr. Lichtman's calculations produce an Anglo crossover rate of 30.75 (unweighted mean). He conceded that in the general election Black turnout will fall to the range of 31, 32 or perhaps 33%, while Anglo turnout will jump into the 60's, approximately a two to one margin. Just how far this argument departs from the *Gingles* construct is exposed by the reminder that such a crossover rate has been found to establish the absence of Anglo bloc voting under *Gingles*'s third precondition as a matter of law.[115]

The history of the 24th illustrates that Plaintiffs overstate the impact of the Black Democrats' control of the primaries. The reality is that Frost has not had a primary opponent since his incumbency began. That no Black candidate has ever filed in a Democratic primary against Frost in a district assertedly controlled by Blacks reflects the accuracy of Congresswoman Johnson's claim that

---

[115] *See Abrams v. Johnson*, 521 U.S. 74, 92 (1997).

District 24 was drawn for an Anglo Democrat.[116] We have no measure of what Anglo turnout would be in a Democratic primary if Frost were opposed by a Black candidate. Plaintiffs' asserted control of Blacks in the primary rests upon the shaky ground that much of the dominating Anglo Democratic vote does not bother to vote in the primary with Frost filing as an unchallenged Anglo. Its premise is that Frost challenged by a Black candidate would not result in a return to primary voting by the Anglo Democrats. In short, that Anglo Democrats control this district is the most rational conclusion.

Nor is the cohesiveness of this 21.6% black voting age population clear. Plaintiffs' expert relied heavily upon the high vote in the district for Ron Kirk, an African-American and former popular mayor of Dallas, in his race for the United States Senate. Dr. Lichtman resisted the suggestion that the "friends and neighbors" effect was distorting the results with the counter suggestion that the effect would be offset by Kirk's opponent in the Democratic primary, Victor Morales. That explanation is not persuasive. Morales is actually from Crandall, a town of 3,000 people some 75 miles away. In the 1998 Attorney General race, Judge Morris Overstreet, a widely known, respected, and distinguished lawyer and judge, took 66% of the Black vote in Dallas County and 76% of the Black vote in Tarrant County. Julius Whittier, a Black candidate in the 2002 race for the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, received 32% of the Anglo vote and 40% of the Black vote. In

---

[116] *See supra* note 108. District 24 adjoins Johnson's District 30, a *Gingles*-mandated district, meaning it exists because Anglos vote as a block to defeat Black preferences.

short, whether Blacks vote cohesively in the primary is far from certain.

That Blacks wield influence in the district is plain. Perhaps recognizing the difficulty of arguing that some specie of a relaxed *Gingles* construct imposes an obligation to create an influence or coalition district, Plaintiffs offer a fall-back alternative: that as an "influence district," the 24th cannot be "intentionally" redrawn. But this turns the principle of *Georgia v. Ashcroft* on its head. As we have explained, *Ashcroft* gave states greater latitude in complying with the Voting Rights Act. The Court recognized that while *Gingles* in application has resulted in significant gains in elected positions held by minorities, with the keener edge of computer drawn lines, it has also created "safe" white and minority districts, significantly reducing the necessity for the pull and tug to secure support from those with political influence. By locking in safe districts for minorities and Anglos alike – instead of encouraging competition and the pull and tug of politics – this legal regime began to undermine the core idea that the House of Representatives would be the branch of government directly responsive to the people. *Ashcroft* responds to these and other political realities with greater concern for forces that divide and fractionalize, especially those that would divide along racial lines. We do not read *Ashcroft* as fencing even more territory from state legislative reach. Considering that District 24 as a pure influence district is unprotected by § 2, we are persuaded that alterations to it raised questions primarily of § 5, which have been answered by the Department of Justice.

C

Although the bulk of Plaintiffs' argument focuses on District 24, Plaintiffs also assert that Plan 1374C violates § 2 by modifying minority influence districts in Central and East Texas, specifically districts 1, 2, 4, 9, 10, 11, and 17 from Plan 1151C. According to Plaintiffs, the minority population in these districts will have only a minimal role in the electoral process under the new plan.

However, as the State points out, Plaintiffs never argue – and certainly never prove – that any of these districts satisfies the *Gingles* preconditions. Even a cursory glance at the population data reveals that none of these districts passes muster under *Gingles*'s first prong. In none of these districts does the citizen voting age population of any cognizable minority group surpass 22%, and in most the percentage is significantly lower. Indeed, even if we were to follow Plaintiffs' suggestion and combine the Black and Hispanic citizen voting numbers – despite the lack of evidence of cohesion among these groups[117] – the districts would still fail the first *Gingles* precondition by large margins. The evidence convinces us that these districts are influence districts at best, although we note that these districts vary considerably in the opportunity they afford minorities as a group to play any significant role in the electoral process. The population statistics summarized below bring this conclusion into sharper focus.

---

[117] The record, we should note, is largely bereft of evidence that Hispanics and Blacks vote cohesively as a group in these districts. We therefore echo our conclusion on District 24 and find that Plaintiffs have failed to prove that the Latino and Black communities in Districts 1, 2, 4, 9, 10, and 11 function as a cohesive voting bloc.

District	Plan 1151C			Plan 1374C		
	Black CVAP	Hispanic CVAP	B&H CVAP	Black CVAP	Hispanic CVAP	B+H CVAP
1	15.8	3.3	19.1	18.2	3.9	22.1
2	14.0	5.2	19.1	19.3	8.2	27.5
4	11.5	4.1	15.6	10.3	3.9	14.2
9	21.3	9.7	31.0	46.8	16.8	63.6
10	11.8	22.0	33.8	9.7	12.1	21.8
11	15.2	11.6	26.8	4.3	21.9	26.2
17	4.0	14.5	18.5	10.0	9.8	19.8

Plaintiffs admit that these seven districts are at most influence districts, but nonetheless urge that the State, after *Ashcroft,* is forbidden from altering them. Plaintiffs, however, do not argue that any of these districts is protected individually; they focus instead on these districts as a group and suggest that the State, by redrawing these seven influence districts plus the coalition districts in Districts 23 and 24, has gone too far in limiting minority influence statewide. We cannot agree. As we explained above, the State was under no § 2 obligation to create these districts, and we find that the State labors under no corresponding compulsion to preserve these districts. The allegation that the minority voting strength in these districts has been diluted is in truth no more than a claim that these districts have been drawn to add Republican voting strength to overcome the election advantage that the current Democrat incumbents hold.

VI

We next examine the challenge brought by and on behalf of Latino plaintiffs and intervenors to the impact of the legislative plan on Latino voting strength in South and West Texas. At the outset, it is useful to understand that the difficulties Texas presents to a redistricter are nowhere greater than in the Southern and western part of the State. The area can be described as a huge and rough inverted triangle, beginning in El Paso at the far western corner, extending south and east for hundreds of sparsely populated miles on or near the border to the cities of Laredo in Webb County, McAllen in Hidalgo County, and Brownsville in Cameron County, turning north up to the coastal city of Corpus Christi in Nueces County, then turning west to cover many miles that are lightly populated except for the areas to the south of San Antonio in Bexar County and Austin in Travis County. The sheer size of the land, its irregular shape, and the distribution of the bulk of the population in various pockets of the State are the basics that shape the map before the redistricter even begins. This part of the State also contains the greatest concentrations of Hispanic population. In the State as a whole, Latinos account for approximately 32% of the total population, 29% of the voting age population, and 22% of the citizen voting age population. In the South and West Texas regions at issue here, Hispanics represent 58% of the citizen voting age population. The largest numbers of Hispanics are located in the same areas of South and West Texas as are the large pockets of Anglo population: in El Paso County in the southwest corner; in Webb County, Hidalgo County, and Cameron County in South Texas along the border and in the Rio Grande Valley; in Nueces County in the east along the coast; and in Central Texas in Bexar County and Travis County.

The plan the *Balderas* court approved to account for the population changes documented in the 2000 census, Plan 1151C, placed six congressional districts in South and West Texas, each containing the 651,620 individuals needed for equal population distribution and the mandate of one-man-one-vote. In Plan 1374C, the Legislature drew seven congressional districts in the same area, each containing the necessary 651,620 individuals. In both plans, six districts have a majority Hispanic citizen voting age population. Of the 44 counties included in the six districts in Plan 1151C and the 58 counties included in the seven districts in Plan 1374C, only the seven counties listed above – El Paso, Webb, Hidalgo, Cameron, Nueces, Travis, and Bexar – have populations above 100,000.

This combination of geography and population distribution fixes certain characteristics of the redistricting map for South and West Texas, reflected in both Plan 1151C and Plan 1374C. Both have a district in the far western corner of the State, in El Paso County, which has a population approaching 680,000. Under both Plan 1151C and Plan 1374C, Congressional District 16 in part of El Paso County has a majority Hispanic citizen voting age population and is an effective "safe" Hispanic opportunity district. Plan 1374C leaves Congressional District 16 essentially unchanged, a decision not challenged in this case. But east of this far western population pocket, the counties are so sparsely populated that the district next to 16 – Congressional District 23 – must extend far to the east to reach the numbers of people

necessary to satisfy equipopulosity.[118] A map drawer must travel east almost 800 miles to reach another county that approaches, much less exceeds, 100,000 souls: Webb County, at the western edge of the southern tip of Texas.

In Plan 1151C, Webb County, with 193,117 people, is kept entirely in Congressional District 23; in Plan 1374C, Webb County is divided between Congressional District 23 and Congressional District 28, directly to the east. Whether Webb County is divided or not, the districts that begin in the relatively narrow and relatively densely populated southern part of Texas, which includes the Rio Grande Valley, must extend north to gather enough population to satisfy equality among the districts. Both Plan 1151C and Plan 1374C share this characteristic. Plan 1151C has two "strip" districts that begin in South Texas and travel to the north toward the center of the State to gather the requisite number of people.[119] Plan 1374C has three "strip" districts that begin in South Texas; each of those districts follows the same north-south path and has

---

[118] The map reveals that Hudspeth County, next to El Paso County, includes 3,344 people; Culberson County and Jeff Davis County directly to the east contain 2,975 and 2,207 people, respectively. Presidio County to the southeast is the only county between El Paso and Maverick Counties with an excess of 50% or more Hispanic voting age population, and it has only 7,304 people. The vast area between Presidio and Maverick Counties includes Brewster County, with 8,866 people; Terrell County, with 1,081 people; Val Verde County, with 44,856 people; and Kinney County, with 3,379 people.

[119] Many of the counties north of Hidalgo County (569,463) and Cameron County (335,227) in the Rio Grande Valley are thinly populated. They include Jim Hogg County, northwest of Hidalgo County (5,281); McMullen County (851); Kenedy County (414); Live Oak County (12,309); and Goliad County (6,928).

the same shape as in Plan 1151C, but is narrower and longer to accommodate three districts rather than two. In both Plan 1151C and Plan 1374C, the redistricter traveling north largely avoided the area that is Congressional District 20, which includes San Antonio in Bexar County and is a "safe" Hispanic district.

The map drawer defining the district in the southeastern corner of the State must also begin in the Rio Grande Valley and proceed north to include enough people to satisfy equipopulosity. The map drawer need not travel as far north as in the "strip" districts to find the necessary population for this southeastern coastal district, however, because Nueces County, which contains Corpus Christi, has over 300,000 people.

Both Plan 1151C and Plan 1374C exhibit similar features, resulting from this combination of geography and population distribution. The district that begins just east of El Paso County must be large and must run east from far West Texas, stretching deeply into Central and South Texas. The districts that begin in far South Texas must run north in "strip" fashion into Central Texas. The district that begins in the southern tip of Texas and travels up the coast must also proceed north.

Against this backdrop, we examine the record as to the effects of the legislative plan in South and West Texas on Latino voting strength.

A

In Plan 1151C, the court drew six districts in South and West Texas, each with a majority of the Latino citizen voting age population. As noted, two of those districts,

Congressional District 16, consisting primarily of part of the city of El Paso, and Congressional District 20, consisting primarily of part of the city of San Antonio, are not at issue in the change from Plan 1151C to Plan 1374C and are not challenged in this suit. Both were, and are, effective Hispanic opportunity districts. One of the districts in Plan 1151C, Congressional District 23, had a bare majority of Hispanic citizen voting age population and had not performed consistently as a Hispanic opportunity district. Congressional Districts 28, 15, and 27 made up the remainder of the districts in South and West Texas, each with a majority Hispanic citizen voting age population and a majority of the Spanish-surnamed registered voters, and each performing as effective Hispanic opportunity districts. Each of the six districts in South and West Texas under Plan 1151C was reliably Democratic in both congressional and other elections, with the exception of Congressional District 23. That district has since 1992 elected a Hispanic Republican to Congress, Henry Bonilla.

In Plan 1374C, the Legislature sought to apply to South and West Texas its primary partisan goal of increasing the likelihood that Republican candidates would be elected to Congress, while avoiding violations of the Voting Rights Act, the Equal Protection Clause, and the mandate of one-man-one-vote. The record presents undisputed evidence that the Legislature desired to increase the number of Republican votes cast in Congressional District 23 to shore up Bonilla's base and assist in his reelection. The evidence showed that Bonilla had lost a larger amount of Hispanic support in each successive election. In 2002, Bonilla attracted only 8% of the Latino vote. In order to make Congressional District 23 more Republican, the map drawers extended the district north to take in largely

Republican and Anglo areas in the north-central part of the State, including Bandera, Kerr, and Kendall counties. That change added approximately 101,260 people to Congressional District 23. The legislative plan moved the district line at the eastern edge to divide the southern border city of Laredo, in Webb County. That change resulted in 99,776 individuals, who were more than 90% Hispanic in voting age population and 86.5% Democratic in voting according to the 2002 statewide election data, being placed in the adjacent district, Congressional District 28. Although Congressional District 23 still had a majority of Hispanics – 55.1% – and a bare majority of Hispanics of voting age – 50.9% – it no longer had a majority of citizen voting age Hispanics. In the reconfigured Congressional District 23 in Plan 1374C, Hispanics accounted for 46% of the citizens of voting age, and only 44% of the registered voters had Spanish surnames. By contrast, Congressional District 23 in Plan 1151C had a 57.5% Hispanic citizen voting age population and 55.3% Spanish-surnamed registered voters. To avoid retrogression under § 5, the State created another district in South and West Texas, in which Hispanics were a clear majority of the citizen voting age population. The State then had to adjust the population distributions to avoid inequality among the districts.

To accomplish the first goal, Plan 1374C added a third district to the two already long and relatively narrow districts that covered the bottom of the inverted triangle of South Texas and extended north. To maintain the requisite population numbers, each of these three districts had to extend farther north than the two districts had in Plan 1151C. The three districts under Plan 1374C ran from the population pockets near the border north through

sparsely-populated areas to reach the pockets of population in the central part of the State, south and east of San Antonio and Austin. The reconfigured districts each added counties in the process.[120] The two preexisting districts – Congressional Districts 28 and 15 – maintained a majority Hispanic citizen voting age population and a majority of Spanish-surnamed registered voters in Plan 1374C. The newly created District – Congressional District 25 – also had a majority Hispanic citizen voting age population and a majority of Spanish-surnamed registered voters. The district that runs along the eastern border of South Texas, Congressional District 27, similarly maintained a majority Hispanic citizen voting population and a majority of Spanish-surnamed registered voters. As a result, Plan 1374C had seven congressional districts in South and West Texas, six with a majority of Latino citizen voting age population that are, as explained further below, effective Hispanic opportunity districts, and one that is a Hispanic influence district. Plan 1151C had six congressional districts in South and West Texas with a majority of Latino citizen voting age population, one of which was not an effective Hispanic opportunity district, but was moving in that direction.

---

[120] Congressional District 23 in Plan 1151C was made up of 24 counties; in Plan 1374C, it included 25 counties. Congressional District 28 included 11 counties in both Plan 1151C and Plan 1374C. New Congressional District 25 in Plan 1374C comprised 9 counties. Congressional District 15 in Plan 1151C included 8 counties; in Plan 1374C, Congressional District 15 included 13 counties. Congressional District 27 in Plan 1151C included 5 counties; in Plan 1374C, it included 6 counties.

Plaintiffs raise a number of challenges to the redrawn districts in South and West Texas. The GI Forum Plaintiffs claim that Plan 1374C is deficient for the same reason its predecessor, Plan 1151C, was deficient: an additional Latino majority citizen voting age population district should be drawn to achieve compliance with § 2 of the Voting Rights Act. Plaintiffs claim that the legislative plan dilutes Latino voting strength, in violation of § 2. Finally, Plaintiffs claim that in deciding where to draw the lines, the map drawers were predominately driven by ethnicity, in violation of the Equal Protection Clause. Plaintiffs assert that in drawing the excessively long "bacon-strip" districts, Congressional Districts 15, 25, and 28, the Legislature subordinated the traditional redistricting criteria of compactness and respect for communities of interest and political divisions to the need to include sufficient numbers of Latino voters to create majority-minority districts, in a manner forbidden by *Shaw v. Reno* (*Shaw I*)[121] and its progeny.

The State responds by arguing that there have been no developments since the *Balderas* panel issued its opinion to call into question that court's holding that § 2 did not require an additional Latino majority citizen voting age population district in South and West Texas. The State argues that the Supreme Court's decision in *De Grandy v. Johnson*[122] strongly supports its position because the number of effective Latino majority citizen voting age population districts in the relevant area is more than

[121] 509 U.S. 630 (1993).

[122] 512 U.S. 997 (1994).

roughly proportional to the Latino citizen voting age population in that area and as proportional to the Latino citizen voting age population in the State as the *Gingles* requirements support. The State argues, and presented evidence to show, that the changes made to the South and West Texas districts in Plan 1374C resulted from the politically motivated decision to make Congressional District 23 more Republican and improve the reelection chances of the Hispanic Republican incumbent, Congressman Henry Bonilla. The State presented evidence that it could not achieve its political end without splitting Laredo and Webb County to remove reliably Democratic voters; that it added a new district, Congressional District 25, which, with Congressional Districts 15, 28, and 27, provides the same number of effective Latino opportunity districts as did Plan 1151C and meets the requirements of *De Grandy* proportionality; and that ethnicity did not predominate in the numerous decisions involved in the placement of the district lines in Congressional Districts 28, 15, 25, and 27.

The claims that Plaintiffs make as to this part of the State do not raise the questions of coalition districts in which Anglos, Hispanics, and African-Americans are all present, although no minority group is a majority of the relevant population. Rather, Plaintiffs make claims that are more familiar in Voting Rights Act litigation. They claim that in South and West Texas, they are a minority meeting the *Gingles* requirements; that in one district, they have been "cracked" and submerged into an Anglo majority, such that they cannot elect candidates of their choice; and that as to the rest of the districts in the area, although they are a majority of the citizen voting age population, a functional examination reveals that their

ability effectively to elect their candidates of choice has been weakened. The fact that the dilution claim is familiar, however, does not make the analysis simple. As the Supreme Court stated in *De Grandy,* "Plaintiffs challenging single-member districts may claim, not total submergence, but partial submergence; not the chance for some electoral success in place of none, but the chance for more success in place of some. When the question thus comes down to the reasonableness of drawing a series of district lines in one combination of places rather than another, judgments about inequality may become closer calls." [123]

B

The GI Forum Plaintiffs allege that they are entitled under § 2 to an additional district in South and West Texas in which Latinos are a majority of the citizen voting age population and can effectively elect candidates of their choice. In both Plan 1151C and Plan 1374C, six districts in South and West Texas have a majority of Latino citizens of voting age. The GI Forum Plaintiffs present a demonstration district, Plan 1385C, that shows an additional Latino citizen voting age majority district in South and West Texas. The record contains variations of proposed districting plans that meet the same goal. These Plaintiffs, however, have presented no convincing basis to reject the *Balderas* holding that § 2 did not require an additional district in South and West Texas after the 2000 census.

The GI Forum Plaintiffs argue that since *Balderas,* additional data has become available distinguishing the

[123] *Id.* at 1012-13.

citizen voting age population by race and ethnicity, making it easier to establish that an additional *Gingles* district can be drawn in South and West Texas. Plaintiffs presented demonstration plans to the *Balderas* panel that they claimed showed the feasibility of drawing an additional Hispanic citizen voting age population majority district in the area. The *Balderas* panel found that Plaintiffs had failed to prove that § 2 required the creation of an additional Latino citizen voting age majority congressional district in South and West Texas. Plaintiffs appealed that finding; the Supreme Court summarily affirmed. The additional census data Plaintiffs present does not alter the validity of that finding.[124]

[124] There is an obvious difference between the roles of the *Balderas* court and this court. The *Balderas* court had the remedial task of crafting a congressional redistricting plan according to neutral factors because the Legislature had failed to implement a plan following the 2000 census. This court, by contrast, must carefully and thoroughly examine the legislative redistricting plan to determine whether the Legislature used factors and reached results that violate federal law. This court is "barred from intervening in state apportionment in the absence of a violation of federal law precisely because it is the domain of the States, and not the federal courts, to conduct apportionment in the first place. Time and again [the Supreme Court has] emphasized that 'reapportionment is primarily the duty and responsibility of the State through its legislature or other body, rather than [that] of a federal court'" *Voinovich v. Quilter*, 507 U.S. 146, 156 (1993) (quoting *Growe v. Emison*, 507 U.S. 25, 34 (1993)). "Because the 'States do not derive their reapportionment authority from the Voting Rights Act, but rather from independent provisions of state and federal law,' . . . the federal courts are bound to respect the States' apportionment choices unless those choices contravene federal requirements." *Id.* The difference in the roles played by the *Balderas* court and this court does not lead to a difference in outcome as to the issue of an additional Hispanic majority citizen voting age population district in South and West Texas.

The GI Forum Plaintiffs assert that they have met the *Gingles* criteria because their demonstration plan, 1385C, creates seven districts with a Hispanic citizen voting age population above 50%. The record, however, does not show that their demonstration plan would satisfy *Gingles*. Plan 1385C proposes districts that are more unusually shaped than in either Plan 1151C or Plan 1374C.[125] The

[125] In the demonstration plan, 1385C, Congressional District 23 is almost bisected by Congressional District 25, which surrounds the intruding district on three sides. Congressional District 25 travels north, then west, with an arm that projects to the northeast into Central Texas. Congressional District 15 goes from the Rio Grande Valley east to the coast north of Nueces County, then cuts north into Central Texas. A comparison of the compactness scores between the two plans understates the unusual shapes of the proposed demonstration district, as compared to both 1151C and 1374C. The "smallest circle" figure is a "dispersion" measure that captures the density of a district by calculating the ratio of the district's area to the area of the minimum circle that could circumscribe it. The "perimeter to area" measure captures the irregularity or jaggedness of a district's border by calculating the ratio of the district's area to the square of its perimeter. At trial, Plaintiffs vigorously criticized the legislative plan for high compactness scores, particularly for Congressional Districts 15 and 25. While those districts have slightly better compactness scores in the demonstration plan, the perimeter to area scores for Congressional Districts 23 and 28, which begins in Bexar County and moves toward Travis County, taking small parts of five different counties, are significantly worse. And Plaintiffs' criticisms of parts of Plan 1374C for extending certain districts across disparate and distant communities would seem even more applicable to parts of demonstration Plan 1385C.

	Perimeter to Area		Smallest Circle	
Congressional District	1374c	1385c	1374c	1385c
15	11.6	8.8	6.5	5.4
16	3.8	4.1	2.9	4.6
20	7.3	5.8	3.0	2.7
23	5.1	9.4	3.8	4.5

(Continued on following page)

demonstration plan Plaintiffs present underscores the difficulty of drawing seven, rather than six, Latino opportunity districts that meet the *Gingles* requirements in the vast geography and irregularly distributed population of South and West Texas.

Even if this court were to assume that the finding in *Balderas* rejecting the claim that an additional Hispanic citizen voting age population majority district should be drawn in South and West Texas was entitled to no weight, and even if this court were to overlook the *Gingles* problems reflected in the proffered demonstration plan, the GI Forum Plaintiffs have failed to make the necessary showing under § 2. This court recognizes that Plaintiffs have established racially polarized voting and a political, social, and economic legacy of past discrimination. But any examination of the totality of the circumstances beyond *Gingles* must include proportionality. Plaintiffs argue that because Latinos represent 22% of the citizen voting age population of the State, seven out of the thirty-two districts in the State should be drawn to produce Latino citizen voting age majorities. The State responds by noting that Latinos comprise 58% of the citizen voting age population in South and West Texas and constitute the majority of the citizen voting age population in six out of the seven districts in that region, exceeding rough proportionality for

25	9.6	5.9	8.5	2.8
27	5.1	3.4	3.1	3.1
28	5.7	10.0	5.0	6.0

the area.[126] The State also argues that even considering all of Texas as the relevant area for measuring proportionality, an examination of the totality of the circumstances does not lead to the conclusion that an additional Latino majority citizen voting age population district must be drawn in South and West Texas.

The Supreme Court has explained that "proportionality," a word not expressly used in § 2, involves a comparison between (1) the percentage share of legislative districts in which the population of the protected class has a majority and (2) the protected class's percentage share of the "relevant population."[127] Proportionality is an important aspect

[126] The State provides an analysis, as follows:

1374C Districts	Total CVAP	Percent Hispanic
15	379,368	58.5%
16	359,793	69.9%
20	419,668	60.8%
23	407,130	45.8%
25	358,683	55.0%
27	398,328	60.4%
28	404,341	56.2%
TOTAL	2,727,311	57.94%

(State's Post-Trial Br. at 62).

[127] *De Grandy*, 512 U.S. at 1014 n. 11. "Proportionality" in this sense is only one factor to be considered in assessing the totality of circumstances to determine if unlawful vote dilution has created an "unequal political and electoral opportunity" for a protected class. *Id.* at 1022. Just as the Supreme Court in *De Grandy* made clear that "proportionality" of opportunity cannot be a "safe harbor" precluding § 2 liability, which turns on total circumstances, *id.* at 1017-22 so, too, a showing of lack of proportionality is but one factor in the total circumstances analysis. The Supreme Court has made clear that "the degree of probative value assigned to proportionality may vary with other facts. No single statistic provides courts with a shortcut to determine whether

(Continued on following page)

in evaluating "equality of opportunity, [but is] not a guarantee of electoral success for minority-preferred candidates."[128]

The Supreme Court has not resolved what geographic frame of reference should be used to analyze proportionality, whether it is by district, county, region, or state. In *DeGrandy,* "the plaintiffs . . . passed up the opportunity to frame their dilution claim in statewide terms"; the Court applied the *Gingles* factors and analyzed proportionality as limited to "Hispanics in the Dade County area."[129] In this case, however, Plaintiffs do not argue that the *Gingles* criteria justify the creation of any additional Latino citizen voting age majority districts outside South and West Texas. Despite the presence of large numbers of Hispanics elsewhere in the State, and despite the presence of racially polarized voting throughout the State, no plaintiff asserts that the *Gingles* criteria would permit an additional Latino citizen voting age population majority district anywhere but in South and West Texas. Again, the combination of geography and population distribution quickly explain why. The areas in which Latinos account for 50% or more of the voting age population are confined to El Paso County in far West Texas, surrounded by counties of vast space and little population; Presidio County in West Texas along the border, which has only 7,304 people and is surrounded by vast space with little population; and the South Texas area from Maverick County to the Rio Grande Valley. The Latino population in the rest of the State is numerous, but

---

a set of single-member districts unlawfully dilutes minority voting strength." *Id.* at 1020-21.

[128] *Id.* at 1014 n. 11.

[129] *Id.* at 1022.

dispersed over large areas.[130] Lower courts that have analyzed "proportionality" in the *De Grandy* sense have been consistent in using the same frame of reference for that factor and for the factors set forth in *Gingles*.[131] If South and West Texas is the only area in which *Gingles* is applied and can be met, as Plaintiffs argue, it is also the relevant area for measuring proportionality. Because the Supreme Court has not yet provided precise guidance on the proper standard for assessing proportionality, however, we also examine proportionality on a statewide basis.

Under the legislative plan, 1374C, as under the court-imposed plan it replaces, 1151C, six out of the seven districts in South and West Texas are Latino citizen voting age majority districts. Given the fact that Latinos comprise 58% of the citizen voting age population in South and West Texas, proportionality is satisfied as to that area.

As noted, the Supreme Court has not made clear what geographic unit is the relevant area to measure proportionality. *De Grandy* did not discuss the role of a district such as Congressional District 29 in the Houston area of

---

[130] *See* Jackson Pls.' Ex. 64.

[131] *See, e.g., Old Person v. Brown*, 312 F.3d 1036, 1047-49 (8th Cir. 2002) (emphasizing that the same frame of reference should be used for analyzing proportionality and the *Gingles* factors); *Rural W. Tenn. African-Am. Affairs Council v. Sundquist*, 209 F.3d 835, 840-41 (6th Cir. 2000) (using the same six-county frame of reference to examine proportionality and the *Gingles* factors); *Solomon v. Liberty County Comm'rs*, 221 F.3d 1218, 1220 (11th Cir. 2000) (using the same county as a frame of reference in analyzing all factors); *African-Am. Voting Rights Legal Def. Fund, Inc. v. Villa*, 54 F.3d 1345, 1354-55 (8th Cir. 1995) (using all 28 wards of the city of St. Louis as the frame of reference for analyzing both proportionality and the *Gingles* preconditions).

Harris County, or Congressional District 23 in West Texas, in which Latinos constitute approximately 47% of the citizen voting age population, less than a majority but large enough to constitute an influence district, in assessing proportionality as part of the totality of the circumstances. Plaintiffs are correct in their calculation that six districts in which Latinos hold a majority of citizen voting age population, out of the thirty-two districts that comprise Texas, do not equate to arithmetic proportionality between the number of Latino majority-minority districts and the Latinos' percentage of the citizen voting age population in the State. *De Grandy* emphasizes, however, that the inquiry is not merely mathematical.[132] Rather, *De Grandy* requires an examination of whether the totality of circumstances includes rough proportionality between the number of *effective* majority-minority districts that can be drawn meeting the *Gingles* factors and the minority members' share of the relevant population.[133]

One of the districts that Plaintiffs would create in their demonstration plan, proposed Congressional District

---

[132] 512 U.S. at 1023.

[133] *Id.* at 1024. This circuit, along with every other circuit to consider the question, has concluded that the relevant voting population for Hispanics is citizen voting age population. *See Valdespino v. Alamo Heights Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 168 F.3d 848, 853 (5th Cir. 1999); *Perez v. Pasadena Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 165 F.3d 368, 372 (5th Cir. 1999); *Campos v. City of Houston*, 113 F.3d 544, 548 (5th Cir. 1997) (courts "must consider the citizen voting-age population of the group challenging the electoral practice when determining whether the minority group is sufficiently large and geographically compact to constitute a majority"); *Barnett v. City of Chicago*, 141 F.3d 699, 704 (7th Cir. 1998) ("We think that citizen voting-age population is the basis for determining equality of voting power that best comports with the policy of [§ 2].").

28 has a Hispanic citizen voting age population of only 50.3%, and five of the seven districts have a Hispanic citizen voting age population that is below 60%. Plaintiffs vigorously criticize the legislative plan, 1374C, in part because three of the districts it creates – Congressional Districts 15, 25, and 28 – have Hispanic citizen voting age population numbers that are below 60%. Plaintiffs' own experts and argument reminded this court that because of the lower turnout of Latino voters, a low majority of the Hispanic citizen voting age population does not produce an *effective* Latino opportunity district.[134]

Under Plan 1151C, Congressional District 23 was not an effective minority opportunity district, despite the fact that it had a 57.4% Latino citizen voting age majority.

---

[134] Dr. Jerry Polinard, a political scientist testifying for the Valdez-Cox Intervenors, testified that there is "no magic number" as to the level of Spanish-surname voter registration required in order for Hispanics to effectively nominate and elect their candidates of choice, but he noted that "you become comfortable with opportunity districts once you break into those 60%-plus ranges." (Tr. File 8 at 50-51). Dr. Allan J. Lichtman, an expert retained by the Jackson Plaintiffs, testified that reductions in Hispanic citizen voting age population, even to a point where Hispanics still constitute a majority of the electorate, along with low Hispanic voter turnout, can move a district toward "the danger zone" in terms of Latino voting opportunity. (Tr. File 1 at 156-57). Congressman Charlie Gonzalez testified that, "If you just go with population figures . . . [t]hat really doesn't translate to having an effective voice or ability to elect someone of your choice" because the more pertinent indicator is the percentage of Hispanic citizens of voting age who register to vote and actually turn out on election day, which results in far less effectiveness. (Tr. File 1 at 118-19). Congressman Ruben Hinojosa testified that "along the Texas border region from Brownsville to McAllen to Laredo to El Paso . . . in order to win an election, you need to have about 57, 58% or higher Hispanic voter age population because of the low turnout." (Tr. File 4 at 48).

Plaintiffs specifically criticize Congressional District 15 in Plan 1374C, which has a Hispanic citizen voting age population of 58.5% – reduced from 69.3% in Plan 1151C – as weakened to the extent that it is better classified as a Latino influence district rather than a Latino opportunity district, although other witnesses contradicted this characterization.[138] The legislative plan has one fewer district in which Latinos constitute a majority of the citizen voting age population than the demonstration plan. The legislative plan and the demonstration plan, however, have the same number of districts in which Latinos equal or exceed 55% of the citizen voting age population. The legislative plan has one more district in which the Hispanic citizen

---

[138] Dr. Keith Gaddie, a political science expert retained by the State, testified in his deposition that in Congressional District 15 under Plan 1374C, Latinos would control the primary elections but, if turnout was low, might not unilaterally control the outcome of general elections, although Latino candidates of choice would generally be elected. (*See* Gaddie Dep., Jackson Pls.' Ex. 140 at 46-47; Gaddie Report, Jackson Pls.' Ex. 141 at 8). Dr. Gaddie submitted regression data showing that in Congressional District 15, in seven primary or runoff elections, all the Latino candidates of choice would be successful, and five out of six Latino candidates of choice would win in the general elections. (Gaddie Report, Jackson Pls.' Ex. 141 at 7-8). Dr. Lichtman concluded that the turnout of Latino voters in the general election decreased from a mean of 52% under Plan 1151C to a mean of 38% under Plan 1374C, but testified that Congressional District 15 remains a minority opportunity district rather than an influence district. (Lichtman Report, Jackson Pls.' Ex. 1 at 69; Tr. File 1 at 156, 166-67). Dr. Richard Engstrom, an expert retained by the GI Forum Plaintiffs, testified that in Congressional District 15 under Plan 1374C, there was no racially contested election that he examined in which the Latino-preferred candidate lost and that the reduction in Latino turnout in the general election did not make Congressional District 15 ineffective as a Latino opportunity district. (Tr. File 7 at 53, 64-65; *see* Table 3 of Addendum to Engstrom Report, GI Forum's Ex. 130).

voting age population exceeds 60% than the demonstration plan.[138]

The GI Forum Plaintiffs have shown neither that seven districts can be drawn, meeting the threshold *Gingles* requirements, that have a majority of Hispanic citizen voting age population, nor that all such districts, if they could be drawn, would function effectively as Latino opportunity districts. We reject the claim of the GI Forum Plaintiffs that § 2 demands a seventh Hispanic citizen voting age population majority district in South and West Texas. Part of the analysis of the dilution claim, to which we now turn, will explain why we believe the six Hispanic citizen voting age population majority districts drawn in Plan 1374C are effective Hispanic opportunity districts.

C

It is undisputed that Plan 1374C eliminated Congressional District 23 as a district with a Latino majority

[138] The GI Forum provided an analysis, as follows:

	1385C		1374C	
Congressional district	HVAP	HCVAP	HVAP	HCVAP
15	68.7	63.2	64.0	58.5
16	72.7	67.7	74.8	69.9
20	60.7	57.9	63.6	60.8
23	63.5	56.9	50.9	45.8
25	63.8	58.4	63.4	55.0
27	63.5	59.9	64.2	60.4
28	54.3	50.3	60.1	56.2

(GI Forum's Post-Trial Br. at 14).

citizen voting age population for the political purpose of increasing Republican voters in the district and shoring up the reelection chances of the Republican incumbent. To avoid retrogression, Plan 1374C added a new Latino majority citizen voting age population district to the east and reconfigured the existing districts. Plaintiffs complain that the weakening of Congressional District 23, preventing it from continuing to move toward becoming an effective opportunity district, results in dilution in violation of § 2. Plaintiffs argue that the dilution cannot be addressed by the creation of Congressional District 25 as a Latino opportunity district. Plaintiffs also complain that even if dilution is to be measured on a broader basis than a single district, Plan 1374C is dilutive because the reconfiguration of Congressional Districts 15, 28, and 27 weakens Latino voting strength in these districts.

Congressional District 23 is unquestionably not a Latino opportunity district under Plan 1374C. The map drawers divided Webb County, which is 94% Latino. This change removed reliably Democratic voters in Laredo out of Congressional District 23. Under Plan 1374C, the Hispanic citizen voting age population is 46%, reduced from 57.5% in Plan 1151C; the percentage of Spanish-surnamed registered voters is 44% under Plan 1374C, reduced from 55.3% in Plan 1151C. Even as configured under Plan 1151C, however, Congressional District 23 did not perform as an effective opportunity district. The GI Forum Plaintiffs' regression analysis of election data showed that Latino candidates of choice were elected in five out of eight racially contested elections from 1994 to

2002.[137] The record showed, however, that Latino voters in Congressional District 23 were voting against the Republican candidate Bonilla by larger margins in each successive election. Latino voting strength in Congressional District 23 is, unquestionably, weakened under Plan 1374C. The GI Forum regression analysis of election data for Congressional District 23 under Plan 1374C showed that the Hispanic candidates of choice won only one out of eight racially contested elections from 1994 to 2002.[138] Dr. Gaddie's regression data showed that, in Congressional District 23 under Plan 1374C, Hispanic candidates of choice won seven out of seven statewide primaries, but none of the six Hispanic candidates of choice in general elections carried the district.[139]

Plaintiffs claim that the map drawers impermissibly reduced Hispanic voting strength in Congressional District 23 to pursue their political end. Plaintiffs urge that the political end could have been achieved by leaving Webb County whole and redrawing Congressional District 23 to put Bonilla's home in Congressional District 11, where he could have run in an open seat. The State points out that this approach would not have served either the political goal of incumbency protection or of increasing Republican districts, since Congressional District 11 already reliably elects Republicans in congressional and other elections. The change to Congressional District 23 served the dual goal of increasing Republican seats in general and protecting Bonilla's incumbency in particular, with the additional

---

[137] GI Forum's Post-Trial Br. at 15.

[138] Table 3 of Addendum to Engstrom Report, GI Forum's Ex. 130.

[139] Gaddie Report, Jackson Pls.' Ex. 141 at 9-10.

political nuance that Bonilla would be reelected in a district that had a majority of Latino voting age population – although clearly not a majority of citizen voting age population and certainly not an effective voting majority.

Plaintiffs argue that the admittedly political decision to draw the line through the city of Laredo, placing the largely Democratic, Hispanic voters in Congressional District 28 to the east and "stranding" 359,000 Hispanics in Congressional District 23, where they will be submerged in a Republican, Anglo majority district, violates § 2. *De Grandy,* however, rejected the claim of separating heavily Hispanic neighborhoods, fragmenting them in certain districts and packing them into others, as a basis for liability, even if the *Gingles* factors are met, because the totality of the circumstances included a showing that Hispanic voters had effective voting majorities in the relevant area in rough proportion to the their voting age population.[140]

Typically, vote dilution claims address redistricting schemes that take a minority group whose members have the potential to comprise a numerical majority in a geographically compact district and disperse the group across two or more districts, thereby precluding the minority members from constituting an effective majority in either one.[141] Plan 1374C, however, does not produce such an

---

[140] 512 U.S. at 1015-16. The Court noted in *De Grandy* that findings that certain lines were drawn to separate portions of Hispanic neighborhoods, while others drew several Hispanic neighborhoods into a single district, in themselves, "would be to say only that lines could have been drawn elsewhere, nothing more." *Id.*

[141] *See, e.g., Voinovich,* 507 U.S. at 153.

effect in South and West Texas. Instead, Plan 1374C changes the district boundary in a way that divides Democratic Hispanic voters in Webb County, keeping half in Congressional District 23, in which Republican voting strength is increased and Hispanic voting strength is weakened, and placing half in Congressional District 28, in which Latinos have a clear majority of the citizen voting age population, even after a new district, 25, is added as a majority Latino citizen voting age population district. The Legislature also reconfigured Congressional Districts 15, 28, and 27 in ways that both achieved equal population distribution and preserved the majority Latino citizen age voting populations in each of those districts.

Plaintiffs rely on *Shaw v. Hunt* (*Shaw II*)[142] to argue that the State cannot "offset" the reduction of Latino voting strength in Congressional District 23 by creating a new Latino majority citizen voting age district, Congressional District 25, because to do so would "swap" the voting rights of citizens in Congressional District 23 for the rights of those in new Congressional District 25. In *Shaw II*, the Court held that the creation of a remedial district in one area of a state, where polarized voting existed but where a compact majority-minority district could be not drawn, could not compensate for the failure to place a remedial district in another area where it was possible to draw a compact majority-minority district and where polarized voting also existed.[143] The Court held that a bizarrely shaped district "somewhere else in the State"

[142] 517 U.S. 899 (1996).

[143] *Id.* at 917.

does not remedy the "vote-dilution injuries suffered" by minority voters residing where the remedial district could have been drawn.[144] The Court rejected a district drawn in the center of the state to remedy the dilution injury of voters on the southeastern side of the state, not because there were differences in polarization, but because a remedial *Gingles* district could not be drawn in the part of the state that the map drawers selected.[145] In this case, by contrast, in South and West Texas, six *Gingles* Latino citizen voting age population majority districts could be and were drawn.[146] The Legislature did not place the lines of those districts in parts of the State where the *Gingles* requirements were not satisfied; the problem present in *Shaw II* is not involved in this case.

Analysis of the *Gingles* factors shows that the Latino population is sufficiently numerous and distributed as to support the creation of a number of effective districts in South and West Texas with a majority of Latino citizen voting age population. The *Gingles* districts in South and West Texas could be drawn in different ways, within the constraints of geography and population distribution. Both Plan 1151C and Plan 1374C have six districts with a

---

[144] *Id.*

[145] This case reflects what commentators have recognized as a tension in the cases under § 2 between recognizing the individual right to an undiluted vote and the fact that dilution can be determined and remedied only by addressing the aggregate treatment of group members. *See generally* Heather K. Gerken, *Understanding the Right to an Undiluted Vote,* 114 HARV. L. REV. 1663 (2001).

[146] Indeed, in arguing for an additional Latino majority citizen voting age population district, the GI Forum Plaintiffs emphasize that the *Gingles* criteria are met throughout the South and West Texas area.

majority of Latino citizens of voting age. The choices available to the State included the lines of Plan 1374C, which created a new remedial district that had not been present under the previous plan, or the lines of Plan 1151C, keeping Congressional District 23 as a bare majority Hispanic citizen voting age population district, but not drawing another district with a stronger Latino citizen voting age population majority. Most of the Plaintiffs argue that the State should be compelled to return to the lines of Plan 1151C for South and West Texas. Plaintiffs do not argue that the State should both retain the lines of Congressional District 23 under Plan 1151C and add a new majority Hispanic citizen voting age population district along the lines of Congressional District 25. Indeed, there is neither sufficiently dense and compact population in general nor Hispanic population in particular to support such a configuration. But to say that the State could have retained the lines of Congressional District 23 drawn under Plan 1151C and not created a third district based in the Rio Grande Valley with a majority of Hispanic citizen voting age population is different from saying that the State was obligated to make that choice. *Shaw II* does not preclude the State from choosing where and how to draw majority-minority districts in areas where *Gingles* is satisfied. The states retain broad remedial power to choose where and how to draw remedial districts.[147] As the Court noted in *Shaw II,* even if

[147] *See Bush v. Vera,* 517 U.S. 952, 978 ("the States retain a flexibility that federal courts enforcing § 2 lack . . . insofar as deference is due to their reasonable fears of, and to their reasonable efforts to avoid, § 2 liability"); *see also Lawyer v. Dep't of Justice,* 521 U.S. 567, 575-77 (1997).

a violation of § 2 is shown, it does not confer on individual plaintiffs "the right to be placed in a majority-minority district" because "[s]tates retain broad discretion in drawing districts to comply with the mandate of § 2."[148]

To examine whether Plan 1374C impermissibly dilutes the votes of Latinos in South and West Texas, this court must conduct a "comprehensive . . . canvassing of relevant facts" making up the totality of the circumstances, including proportionality, to determine whether the districts drawn under Plan 1374C in South and West Texas are effective Latino opportunity districts.[149] Congressional District 23 is clearly not a minority opportunity district; Congressional Districts 16 and 20 do clearly provide effective Latino citizen voting age population majorities. The disputes center on whether Congressional Districts 15, 25, 28, and 27 as drawn in Plan 1374C will be effective Latino opportunity districts.

Some of the relevant data from the voluminous record is as follows:

	Congressional District	%HCVAP	% SSR (2002)
1151	15	69.3	67.0
1374	15	58.5	56.7

[148] 517 U.S. at 917 n.9; *cf. Georgia v. Ashcroft*, 123 S.Ct. 2498, 2511 (2003) (under § 5, a state may choose to create a certain number of effective majority-minority districts or a greater number of minority influence districts).

[149] *De Grandy*, 512 U.S. at 1011.

1151	25	18.6	15.2
1374	25	55.0	55.6
1151	28	61.4	59.6
1374	28	56.2	54.3
1151	27	63.5	61.6
1374	27	60.4	58.0

The parties also presented detailed regression analyses of election data, performed by different experts.[150] The regression analyses confirmed that in Congressional Districts 15, 25, 28, and 27 under Plan 1374C, the Latino candidate of choice won in nearly every primary and runoff examined. The GI Forum's regression analysis of election data reveals that under Plan 1374C, Latinos elected their candidate of choice in eight out of eight racially contested elections from 1994 to 2002 in every one of the six Latino majority citizen voting age population districts, including Congressional District 15.[151] Dr. Gaddie's

[150] Table 3 of Engstrom Report, GI Forum's Ex. 89; Table 3 of Addendum to Engstrom Report, GI Forum's Ex. 130; Attachments to Gaddie Report, State's Ex. 31.

[151]

Congressional District	**Number of Times Latino-Preferred Candidate was Elected under Plan 1374C in Eight Racially-Contested Elections from 1984-2002**
15	8
16	8
20	8
23	1

(Continued on following page)

report similarly concluded that the Latino candidate of choice won in seven of seven primaries and five of six general elections in Congressional District 15.[152] In Congressional District 25, Dr. Gaddie concluded that Hispanic candidates of choice carried seven of seven statewide primaries and six of six statewide general elections involving candidates of different ethnicity or race, and that in the 2002 contested statewide Democratic primaries and statewide general elections, Hispanic candidates of choice prevailed in five of six primaries and all fifteen general elections.[153] In Congressional District 27, Dr. Gaddie concluded that Hispanic candidates of choice won seven of seven statewide primaries and five of six statewide general elections involving candidates of different ethnicity or race.[154] In Congressional District 28, Dr. Gaddie concluded that Hispanic candidates of choice prevailed in all seven statewide primaries and all six statewide general elections involving candidates of different ethnicity or race.[155]

Although Dr. Lichtman expressed concern when testifying for Plaintiffs that Congressional District 15 and Congressional District 25 might be marginal, or moving

25	8
27	8
28	8

(GI Forum's Post-Trial Br. at 15).

[152] The one Hispanic-preferred candidate loss occurred when 37% of the Hispanic voters supported a Hispanic Republican over an Anglo Democrat. (Gaddie Report, Jackson Pls.' Ex. 141 at 8).

[153] *Id.* at 10.

[154] *Id.* at 11.

[155] *Id.*

toward a "toss-up," he acknowledged on cross-examination that all four of the districts at issue, 15, 25, 27, and 28, are Hispanic opportunity districts, defined as a district in which Hispanic voters have an effective opportunity to control outcomes in both primary and general elections.[156] Dr. Lichtman expressed concern that in Congressional District 25 under Plan 1374C, while Hispanic voters would control the primaries, Congressman Lloyd Doggett, the incumbent in Congressional District 10 under Plan 1151C and an Anglo Democrat, might run and win the general election without a majority of Hispanic votes.[157] Dr. Lichtman nonetheless agreed that Congressman Doggett has had "overwhelming Latino support" in his current congressional district.[158]

Several witnesses expressed particular concern over Congressional District 15, which under Plan 1374C has a Latino citizen voting age population of 58.5% and a Spanish-surnamed registered voter population of 56.7%. Although these numbers are lower than the levels that had been present in Congressional District 15 under Plan 1151C, the regression analyses showed that the Hispanic-preferred candidate won every primary and runoff election studied, and lost in only one general election out of six.[159] Both Dr. Lichtman and Dr. Engstrom testified that Congressional District 15 was a minority opportunity district,

---

[156] Tr. File 1 at 157, 167-68.

[157] *Id.* at 151-52.

[158] *Id.* at 153.

[159] Gaddie Report, Jackson Pls.' Ex. 141 at 8.

although not as strong as it had been under Plan 1374C.[160] In contrast, Dr. Polinard testified that given this reduction in strength, Congressional District 15 was no longer an effective or performing opportunity district, merely an influence district.[161]

In Plan 1151C, Congressional District 27 included all of Cameron County along the border, but only part of Nueces County to the north. In Plan 1374C, Congressional District 27 includes all of Nueces County but divides Cameron County. The result did not significantly change the relevant data. In Plan 1374C, Congressional District 27 has a Hispanic citizen voting age population of 60.4% and a Spanish-surnamed registered voter population of 58%, reduced from a Hispanic citizen voting age population of 63.6% and a Spanish-surnamed registered voter population of 61.6% under Plan 1151C.[162] As noted, the regression analyses showed that Hispanic candidates of choice won seven of seven statewide primaries and five of six statewide general elections involving candidates of different ethnicity.[163] Dr. Lichtman testified that Congressional District 27 under 1374C is a minority opportunity district.[164] Dr. Engstrom testified that Congressional

---

[160] Lichtman Test., Tr. File 1 at 167; Engstrom Test., Tr. File 7 at 64-65.

[161] Tr. File 8 at 53-54, 64.

[162] Gaddie Report, Jackson Pls.' Ex. 141 at Table 3.

[163] *Id.* at 11.

[164] Tr. File 1 at 166-67.

District 27 in Plan 1374C is a district in which Hispanics have the opportunity to elect their preferred candidate.[165]

Congressional District 28 under Plan 1374C includes part of Laredo in South Texas and extends north to the relatively heavily populated areas of Central Texas. The demographic figures show that the district maintains a decisive Hispanic citizen voting age population majority, although reduced from the levels present under Plan 1151C. In Congressional District 28 under Plan 1374C, the Hispanic citizen voting age population is 56.2% and the Spanish-surnamed registered voter population is 54.3%, slightly less than the 61.5% of Hispanic citizen voting age population and 59.6% Spanish-surnamed registered voter population under Congressional District 28 in Plan 1151C.[166]

At trial, witnesses familiar with the areas covered by Congressional Districts 15, 25, 27, and 28 and with the difficulties faced by candidates supported by Latino voters expressed concern as to whether these districts would be effective as Latino opportunity districts.[167] The witnesses testified that the size of the districts; the fact that they include several media markets; and the fact that they combine communities along the border with communities in Central Texas, with diverse needs and interests, could

---

[165] Tr. File 7 at 53-54. Again, Dr. Polinard disagreed, testifying that Congressional District 27 was weakened as compared to Plan 1151C to the point of becoming an influence district. (Tr. File 8 at 48-49).

[166] Gaddie Report, Jackson Pls.' Ex. 141 at Table 3.

[167] *See, e.g.*, Gonzalez Test., Tr. File 1 at 123-24; Hinojosa Test., File 4 at 53; Richard Raymond Test., Tr. File 6 at 85-86; Aaron Pena Test., Tr. File 6 at 168.

make it more difficult for thinly financed Latino-preferred candidates to achieve electoral success and to provide adequate and responsive representation once elected.[168] These concerns bear on the extent to which the new districts are functionally effective Latino opportunity districts, important to understanding whether dilution results from Plan 1374C.[169]

The "bacon-strip" districts – Congressional Districts 15, 25, and 28 – are unquestionably long. Congressional District 25 is 300 miles long and 77% of its total population comes from either end of the district; 39% from Travis County in Central Texas and 38% from Hidalgo County at the southern end. Congressional District 15 is also 300 miles long, from Cameron County in South Texas to Bastrop County in Central Texas, and its population is also concentrated at either end. Congressional District 28 runs nearly 300 miles from Hays County south to Zapata County on the border with Mexico. Districts that began in the same area in Plan 1151C were also long and relatively narrow, extending from the border of South Texas to Central Texas, although not as far. The record does not disclose the number of media markets covered in the districts under Plan 1151C, but it is clear that several of

---

[168] These concerns also bear on Plaintiffs' *Shaw* claim that the map drawers subordinated traditional districting concerns, such as compactness and respecting communities of interest, to the goal of collecting enough Latinos to achieve a majority of citizen voting age population in the districts. *See* Part VI.D.

[169] As *De Grandy* makes clear, the ultimate conclusions about equality of opportunity are to be based on a comprehensive examination of the relevant facts. 512 U.S. at 1011; *see also Harvell v. Blytheville Sch. Dist. No. 5*, 71 F.3d 1382, 1390-91 (8th Cir. 1995).

the areas joined in districts under Plan 1374C were also joined together in districts under Plan 1151C. It is also clear that adding a third district based in the Rio Grande Valley made each of the three districts extend north and include residents of both the Rio Grande Valley and Central Texas. While Latino residents in both areas generally have lower socio-economic indicators than Anglos, the evidence at trial showed that the needs and interests of Latino communities on the South Texas border are different from the needs and interests of Latino communities in Central Texas. The issue is whether these features mean that the newly-configured districts dilute the voting strength of Latinos.

At trial, the court was greatly assisted by the testimony of elected officials from the districts at issue. These witnesses, including Congressman Hinojosa, representing Congressional District 15; State Representative Aaron Pena, who resides in Congressional District 15 and represents a district located in Congressional District 25; State Representative Jim Solis from Cameron County in Congressional District 27; and County Judge Ramon Garcia and County Commissioner Ricardo Godinez from Hidalgo County, were most concerned that the districts would no longer be dominated by the border cities in the Rio Grande Valley. Instead, the districts would also contain a number of constituents from northern, less impoverished communities. The witnesses testified that the size and diversity of the newly-configured districts could make it more difficult for the constituents in the Rio Grande Valley to control election outcomes. For example, witnesses testified that Congressional District 27 under Plan 1374C includes more affluent and higher-turnout voting areas in Nueces County, in contrast to Congressional District 27 in Plan

1151C, which included only half of Nueces County, and expressed concern that Latinos from the border might have difficulty in maintaining control over election outcomes because of low turnout.[170] The district, however, has a Latino citizen voting age majority population of 60.4%, and 58% of the registered voters have Spanish surnames. Witnesses consistently testified that Congressional District 27 under Plan 1374C is a district where Hispanics have an effective opportunity to elect their preferred candidate, and the regression data supports this conclusion.[171] As noted, witnesses testified that Congressional District 25, while a more effective Latino opportunity district than Congressional District 23 had been in Plan 1151C, might elect Lloyd Doggett, a well-known and well-financed Anglo Democrat from Central Texas, to Congress, but acknowledged that many Hispanics support this Anglo Democrat.[172] The legal test of an effective opportunity district is not whether a Hispanic candidate is elected each time, but whether a Hispanic-preferred candidate has an effective opportunity to be elected.[173] Witnesses testified that Congressional Districts 15 and 25 would span *colonias* in Hidalgo County and suburban areas in Central Texas, but the witnesses testified, and the regression data show, that both districts are effective Latino opportunity

---

[170] *See, e.g.*, Hinojosa Test., File 4 at 48-53; Peña Test., Tr. File 6 at 167.

[171] *See, e.g.*, Lichtman Test., Tr. File 1 at 166-67; Engstrom Test., Tr. File 7 at 53-54; Gaddie Report, Jackson Pls.' Ex. 141 at 11.

[172] *See, e.g.*, Lichtman Test., Tr. File 1 at 151-53; Peña Test., Tr. File 6 at 168-69; Polinard Test., Tr. File 8 at 57-58.

[173] *See De Grandy*, 512 U.S. at 1014 n. 11; *Lewis v. Alamance County, N.C.*, 99 F.3d 600, 607 (4th Cir. 1996).

districts, with the Hispanic-preferred candidate winning every primary and general election examined in District 25 and, in District 15, winning every primary and runoff election studied and losing in only one general election out of six.[174] Witnesses testified that Congressional District 28 had been, and would continue to be, an effective Hispanic opportunity district, confirmed by the regression data showing that Hispanic candidates of choice won in every primary and general election examined.[175]

A close examination of the voluminous record and the testimony at trial leads to a finding that Plan 1374C does not impermissibly dilute the voting strength of Latinos in South and West Texas in violation of § 2. The newly-configured Districts 15, 25, 27, and 28 cover more territory and travel farther north than did the corresponding districts in Plan 1151C. The districts combine more voters from the central part of the State with voters from the border cities than was the case in Plan 1151C. The population data, regression analyses, and the testimony of both expert witnesses and witnesses knowledgeable about how politics actually works in the area lead to the finding that in Congressional Districts 25 and 28, Latino voters will likely control every primary and general election outcome; in Congressional Districts 15 and 27, Latino voters will likely control every primary outcome and almost every general election outcome; and in Congressional District 23,

---

[174] *See, e.g.*, Peña Test., Tr. File 6 at 169-72; Polinard Test., Tr. File 8 at 63-65; Ron Kirk Test., Tr. File 4 at 23-24; Gaddie Report, Jackson Pls.' Ex. 141 at 8, 10.

[175] *See* Lichtman Test., Tr. File 1 at 166-67; Engstrom Test., Tr. File 7 at 54; Gaddie Report, Jackson Pls.' Ex. 141 at 11.

Latino voters will likely control every primary outcome but not the general elections. The fact that Hispanic-preferred candidates will have to campaign for votes not only from Latinos in the Rio Grande Valley but also from Latinos in Central Texas in Congressional Districts 25, 28, and 15 does not mean that Latinos have suffered an impermissible dilution of voting strength in those districts. The fact that Latinos from the Rio Grande Valley in Congressional District 27 are combined with voters from Nueces County, while maintaining a decisive citizen voting age population and Spanish-surnamed registered voter majority, as well as consistent electoral control, does not mean that Latinos have suffered an impermissible dilution of voting strength in that district.[176]

As the Court stated in *Gingles,* "[T]he relative lack of minority electoral success under a challenged plan, when compared with the success that would be predicted under the measure of undiluted minority voting strength the court is employing, can constitute powerful evidence of vote dilution."[177] Whether compared to Plan 1151C or to

---

[176] *See De Grandy,* 512 U.S. at 1014 n. 11 ("[T]he ultimate right of § 2 is equality of opportunity, not a guarantee of electoral success for minority-preferred candidates of whatever race."); *Gingles,* 478 U.S. at 47 ("The essence of a § 2 claim is that a certain electoral law, practice, or structure interacts with social and historical conditions to cause an inequality in the *opportunities* enjoyed by black and white voters to elect their preferred representatives.") (emphasis added); *Sanchez v. State of Colorado,* 97 F.3d 1303, 1310 (10th Cir. 1996) ("The lack of electoral *opportunity* is the key."); *Uno v. City of Holyoke,* 72 F.3d 973, 979 (1st Cir. 1995) ("While the statutory scheme does not provide an assurance of success at the polls for minority candidates, it does provide an assurance of fairness.") (citations omitted).

[177] 478 U.S. at 99.

the GI Forum Plaintiffs' demonstration plans, Plaintiffs have not shown an impermissible reduction in effective opportunities for Latino electoral control or in opportunities for Latino participation in the political process. Section 2 guarantees minority voters an effective opportunity to exercise electoral control, not overwhelming electoral majorities or guarantees of success. The totality of facts and circumstances, including those pointing to proportionality, as well as past and predicted election outcomes and evidence as to the likely functioning of the newly-configured districts, does not show a violation of § 2 in South and West Texas under Plan 1374C.

Plaintiffs argue that taking a broad view of the statewide effect of Plan 1374C, dilution results because of the loss of the "influence districts" in other parts of the State in which Latino voters played a role, specifically, Congressional District 24 in Dallas and Tarrant County and Congressional District 10 in Travis County. The State responds in part by pointing to the strengthening of Congressional District 29 in Harris County as a Latino influence district. But Plaintiffs have not urged that additional *Gingles* Latino majority-minority districts can be placed in those areas; they have not identified a wrong in those areas under § 2 that would justify requiring the State to effect a remedy. As the Court explained in *Growe*, "Unless [the *Gingles* prerequisites] are established, there neither has been a wrong nor can be a remedy."[178] Plaintiffs have not met the burden of showing that § 2 forbids the State from making the political choices that primarily

[178] 507 U.S. at 40-41; *see also Harvell*, 71 F.3d at 1393; *Johnson v. Mortham*, 926 F.Supp. 1460, 1473 (N.D. Fla. 1996).

shaped the changes reflected in Plan 1374C because the effects of those changes impermissibly diluted the opportunity of Latinos to participate in the political process.

In *De Grandy,* the Court emphasized that one reason it would not embrace "bottom line" proportionality as a "safe harbor" was that it could make "the most blatant racial gerrymandering in half of a county's single-member Districts . . . irrelevant under § 2 if offset by political gerrymandering in the other half."[179] Plaintiffs argue that the reduction of Congressional District 23 from an emerging effective Hispanic opportunity district for political purposes was political gerrymandering and that the creation of six majority Hispanic citizen voting age population districts in the remainder of West and South Texas resulted from racial gerrymandering. We turn to an examination of this claim.

D

Plaintiffs contend that in Plan 1374C, the map drawers used ethnicity to an unlawful degree and drew districts that reflect a derogation of the traditional districting values of compactness, respect for political lines, and communities of interest. The Supreme Court has phrased the test for a plaintiff bringing such a *Shaw* claim in different ways. In 1995, in *Miller v. Johnson*,[180] the Court struck down a Georgia districting plan on the ground that race had been "the predominant factor motivating the Legislature's decision to place a significant number of

[179] 512 U.S. at 1019.

[180] 515 U.S. 900 (1995).

voters within or without a particular district."[181] That conclusion will generally follow, the Court explained, where "the legislature subordinated traditional race-neutral districting principles ... to racial considerations."[182] In her concurrence in *Bush v. Vera*,[183] Justice O'Connor reaffirmed that test, but explained it in slightly different terms: "[S]o long as they do not subordinate traditional districting criteria to the use of race for its own sake or as a proxy, States may intentionally create majority-minority districts, and may otherwise take race into consideration, without coming under strict scrutiny .... Only if traditional districting criteria are neglected *and* that neglect is predominantly due to the misuse of race" is the district presumptively unconstitutional.[184] States are not required to ignore race; indeed, the Supreme Court has acknowledged that states will always be aware of race when they draw district lines.[185] The factor of race or ethnicity may be considered in the process as long as it does not predominate over traditional race-neutral districting principles.[186] The fact that race is given consideration in the process and the fact that majority-minority districts are intentionally created do not suffice to trigger strict scrutiny.[187]

---

[181] *Id.* at 916.

[182] *Id.*

[183] 517 U.S. 952 (1996).

[184] *Id.* at 993 (O'Connor, J., concurring).

[185] *Miller,* 515 U.S. at 916; *Shaw I,* 509 U.S. at 646.

[186] *Id.; Shaw II,* 517 U.S. at 907 (race is predominate when it is "the criterion that, in the State's view, [can] not be compromised").

[187] *Shaw I,* 509 U.S. at 646; *Bush,* 517 U.S. at 962.

Plaintiffs bear the burden of proving that race was the predominate factor in the Legislature's districting decisions.[188] That burden is significant.[189] As the Court stated in *Miller,* "To invoke strict scrutiny, a plaintiff must show that the State has relied on race in substantial disregard of customary and traditional districting practices . . . [A]pplication of the Court's standard helps achieve *Shaw's* basic objective of making extreme instances of gerrymandering subject to meaningful judicial review."[190]

Courts analyzing *Shaw* claims frequently examine: (a) district shape and demographics; (b) statements made by legislators and their staff; and (c) the nature of the data used to determine whether race played an excessive and unjustifiable role in the redistricting process.[191] The parties presented evidence of two widely accepted measures of compactness, "smallest circle" and "perimeter to area" scores.[192] The compactness scores of the challenged districts in Plan 1374C are as follows:

---

[188] *See Bush,* 517 U.S. at 958-59; *Miller,* 515 U.S. at 916.

[189] *Easley v. Cromartie,* 532 U.S. 234, 241 (2001); *Miller,* 515 U.S. at 928 (O'Connor, J., concurring); *see Cano v. Davis,* 211 F.Supp.2d 1208, 1215 (C.D. Cal. 2002) ("All of the racial gerrymandering cases emphasize that a plaintiff bringing such a claim faces an extraordinarily high burden.").

[190] 515 U.S. at 928-29 (O'Connor, J., concurring).

[191] *See Bush,* 517 U.S. at 959; *Miller,* 515 U.S. at 916-19; *Shaw I,* 509 U.S. at 647.

[192] *See* Richard H. Pildes & Richard G. Niemi, *Expressive Harms, "Bizarre Districts," and Voting Rignts: Evaluating Election-District Appearances After Shaw v. Reno,* 92 MICH. L. REV. 483 (1993), cited in *Shaw II,* 517 U.S. at 923, 931.

	CD 23	CD 28	CD 25	CD 15	CD 27
Smallest Circle	3.8	5.0	8.5	6.5	3.1
Perimeter to Area	5.1	5.7	9.6	11.6	5.1

The scores for the corresponding districts in Plan 1151C are:

	CD 23	CD 28	CD 25	CD 15	CD 27
Smallest Circle	4.2	3.7		5.0	3.1
Perimeter to Area	6.1	5.4		8.5	4.1

The general measures of compactness do not lead to a conclusion that the districts in Plan 1374C are bizarre in a *Shaw* sense. Dr. John Alford, an expert witness for the Jackson Plaintiffs, testified that he did not find the perimeter to area scores for Congressional Districts 15, 25, and 28 in Plan 1374C to be troublesome on their own.[193] Neither the smallest circle nor perimeter to area scores of Plan 1374C approach those of districts so bizarrely and irregularly drawn that courts interpret their creation as "an effort to segregate the races for purposes of voting, without regard for traditional districting principles."[194]

---

[193] Tr. File 6 at 25.

[194] *Shaw I*, 509 U.S. at 642; *Hunt v. Cromartie*, 526 U.S. 541, 548 n. 3 (1999).

Compactness scores cannot be considered in isolation; the issue is whether a district's shape, as measured by compactness scores, provides evidence of a constitutional violation when considered in relation to the geography and population distribution in the relevant part of the State.[195] Texas has vast geographical areas with widely dispersed population; except for areas around major cities, the State is a challenge for any redistricter who cherishes compactness as a value.[196] For example, Congressional District 23 in both Plans 1151C and 1374C extends approximately 800 miles along the border. In Plan 1151C, Congressional District 17 in the north-central part of the State includes 36 counties. Under Plan 1151C, Congressional District 13 in North Texas is larger than a number of states, spanning 40,000 square miles and 43 counties, but many with fewer than three thousand people.[197]

Texas geography and population dispersion limit the availability of district compactness in the southern and western regions of the state. Under Plan 1374C, the population densities in Congressional Districts 28, 25, and 15, both Anglo and Hispanic, are highest in the Valley and in Central Texas, separated by relatively sparsely populated areas. The high-density population pockets necessary to

---

[195] *See Miller*, 515 U.S. at 917 ("Although by comparison with other districts the geometric shape of the Eleventh District may not seem bizarre on its face, when its shape is considered in conjunction with its racial and population densities, the story of racial gerrymandering . . . becomes much clearer.").

[196] Indeed, Dr. Alford conceded that Texas has not valued compactness during the period in which Texas has engaged in districting. Tr. File 6 at 21.

[197] BARONE, supra note 105, at 1548, 1557, 1576.

achieve the one-man-one-vote requirement are situated at either end of the elongated "bacon-strip" shaped districts. As a result, the boundaries of such "strip" districts in Plan 1374C must reach into Central Texas to obtain the requisite number of people, whether Anglo or Latino. For example, in Congressional District 15, the "dumbbell" district, 90% of the population is in the northern and southern tips. Congressional District 15 was already a "strip" district in Plan 1151C; in Plan 1374C, legislators elongated it to add people because part of the lower half was used to create new Congressional District 25. The smallest circle measure of compactness for the southern and western districts in Plan 1374C, examined in relation to the geography and population, reflect the sheer size and population distribution of the area, rather than a calculated stretch to find voters of a particular ethnic makeup.[198]

The perimeter to area scores for Plan 1374C similarly do not reflect the predominance of ethnicity in drawing the district lines. Perimeter to area calculations are useful for determining whether the map drawers used convoluted lines to bring members of one racial group into a district while excluding members of another racial group. An examination of Congressional Districts 25, 28, 15, and 27, in relation to the population distribution within and without the district lines, does not reveal lines precisely drawn to include Hispanics and exclude Anglo voters, to

[198] *Cf. Theriot v. Parish of Jefferson*, 185 F.3d 477, 487-88 (5th Cir. 1999) (rejecting a claim of racial gerrymandering where one-man-one-vote considerations and the district's geography substantially limited the ability of map drawers to adhere to compactness standards).

ensure Hispanic citizen voting age majority districts, but rather lines drawn to include enough voters to meet the one-man-one-vote constitutional requirement. An examination of the record, including the maps that show the relationship of Hispanic voting age population to district lines in Congressional Districts 15, 25, and 28, does not show that the districts were extended north in a determined search for Hispanics, in contrast to the way in which the districts in *Miller, Bush,* and *Shaw* twisted or spanned diverse areas to reach every available minority of voting age population.[199] Neither the districts' shape nor their shape in relation to ethnic demographics and population densities provides circumstantial evidence of forbidden racial gerrymandering.

Plaintiffs criticized the Legislature for "cracking" Webb County in a way that removed a large number of Latino voters from Congressional District 23 and placed them in Congressional District 28. The State presented undisputed evidence that the Legislature changed the lines of Congressional District 23 to meet the political purpose of making the district more Republican and protecting the incumbent, Congressman Bonilla. Plaintiffs agree that the primary purpose of this change was political and concede that there is a strong correlation between Latino and Democratic voters. Dr. Lichtman stated in his report that the change in the Webb County district boundary affected an area of voters who were more than 90% Hispanic in voting age population and 86.5% Democratic in voting, according to the 2002 statewide elections.[200]

---

[199] *See* Jackson Pls.' Ex. 59-63.

[200] *See* Jackson Pls.' Ex. 1 at 57.

Plaintiffs nonetheless fault the Legislature for drawing a line that separated Hispanic voters, recognizing that they were also reliably Democratic voters, to achieve the political purpose.[201]

The Supreme Court has recognized that a legislature "must have discretion to exercise the political judgment necessary to balance competing interests," and that courts must "exercise extraordinary caution in adjudicating

---

[201] The GI Forum Plaintiffs presented Dr. Morgan Kousser, a political scientist, as an expert witness on determining legislative intent to discriminate in a redistricting plan. Dr. Kousser criticized the Legislature for "tak[ing] a correlation between voting and race that's true in Texas now . . . and freez[ing] it in place. . . . It would be possible, had the redistricting chosen other means, that in some future redistricting partisanship and race would not be so highly correlated and that you could attain a partisan end without using racial means. But the Republicans chose to do it in a different way, a way that only achieves the partisan end by using the racial means. And my conclusion is that they chose that on purpose and that was a racially discriminatory intent." (Tr. File 7 at 118-19). Dr. Kousser's conclusion of discrimination is not supported by the current case law, which recognizes that a partisan goal is permissible and that where, as here, there is a strong correlation between race or ethnicity and party, drawing district lines along political lines that may coincide with racial or ethnic lines does not evidence intentional racial discrimination. *See Hunt*, 526 U.S. at 551-52. Dr. Kousser's criticism of the State's choice to create a "safe" Hispanic majority district in Congressional District 25 rather than allow Congressional District 23 to continue as an evolving Hispanic influence district is a criticism of the wisdom of the Legislature's redistricting approach, rather than its legality. As the Supreme Court recently stated in *Georgia v. Ashcroft*, "[A] State may choose to create a certain number of 'safe' districts, in which it is highly likely that minority voters will be able to elect the candidate of their choice. . . . Alternatively, a State may choose to create a greater number of districts in which it is likely – although perhaps not quite as likely as under the benchmark plan – that minority voters will be able to elect candidates of their choice." 123 S.Ct. at 2511.

claims that a State has drawn district lines on the basis of race."[202] In this case, the State has articulated a political reason for the districting decision, protecting a Republican incumbent. The Supreme Court has recognized that incumbency protection can explain a state's decision to depart from other traditional districting principles as well as, or even better than, race.[203] In *Theriot v. Parish of Jefferson*,[204] the Fifth Circuit rejected a racial gerrymander claim where "the inclusion or exclusion of communities was inexorably tied to issues of incumbency."[205] The decision to move the southeastern edge of Congressional District 23 to the west affected voters whose ethnicity and political partisanship voting achieved strong correlation. Under such circumstances, caution requires this court to defer to the Legislature's discretion.[206] As the Supreme Court has stated, "a jurisdiction may engage in constitutional political gerrymandering, even if it so happens that the most loyal Democrats happen to be Black Democrats and even if the state were *conscious* of that fact."[207] The

---

[202] *Miller*, 515 U.S. at 915-16.

[203] *Bush*, 517 U.S. at 967; *Karcher v. Daggett*, 462 U.S. 725, 740 (1983) (recognizing incumbency protection as a legitimate state goal in reapportionment).

[204] 185 F.3d 477 (5th Cir. 1999).

[205] *Id.* at 486.

[206] *See Easley*, 532 U.S. at 242 ("Caution is especially appropriate . . . where the State has articulated a legitimate political explanation for its districting decision, and the voting population is one in which race and political affiliation are highly correlated.").

[207] *Hunt*, 526 U.S. at 551; *see id.* at 551-52 ("Evidence that blacks constitute even a supermajority in one congressional district while amounting to less than a plurality in a neighboring district will not, by itself, suffice to prove that a jurisdiction was motivated by race in drawing its district lines when the evidence also shows a high correlation

(Continued on following page)

geography and population distribution, in relation to the lines drawn in Congressional Districts 15, 23, 25, 27, and 28, do not provide support for Plaintiffs' claim of impermissible racial gerrymandering.

Plaintiffs' primary evidence of a deviation from traditional districting principles is that Congressional Districts 23, 25, 28, 15, and 27 do not observe political lines or respect communities of interest. However, credible testimony from the State's witnesses demonstrated that factors at the heart of traditional districting criteria, including political goals, predominately influenced the numerous decisions embodied in the location of each district line.

In response to Plaintiffs' criticisms, the State provided credible race-neutral explanations for Plan 1374C's county cuts, city divisions, and linking of border and Central Texas communities. The legislative motivation for the division of Webb County between Congressional District 23 and Congressional District 28 in Plan 1374C was political. The State provided evidence that in dividing Webb County, the map drawers in part used the interstate highway as a district boundary, deviating where necessary to achieve population balance.[208] Plaintiffs faulted the inclusion of part of Comal County in Central Texas in Congressional District 28, arguing that legislators drew the line between Congressional District 21 and Congressional

---

between race and party preference."); *Bush*, 517 U.S. at 968 (finding that district lines that correlate with race because they are drawn on the basis of a political affiliation that correlates with race do not amount to a racial classification); *see also Shaw II*, 517 U.S. at 905; *Miller*, 515 U.S. at 916; *Shaw I*, 509 U.S. at 646.

[208] Davis Test., Tr. File 11 at 85.

District 28 to place the heavily Hispanic part of Comal County in Congressional District 28. The State provided evidence of a political reason for this county split: to make Congressional District 21 more safe for its Republican incumbent, who was concerned about the effect of including Democratic-leaning voters in his district because of changes to what had been Congressional District 10 in Plan 1151C. Map drawers placed reliably Democratic voters from Comal County into Congressional District 28 to make up for the inclusion in Congressional District 21 of Democratic voters from Travis County resulting from the changes to former Congressional District 10. The State also presented evidence that the part of Comal County placed in Congressional District 28 corresponded to a local election boundary.[209]

Plaintiffs also faulted the inclusion of a heavily Hispanic part of Hays County, also in Central Texas, in Congressional District 28. The State presented evidence that this decision resulted from the Legislature's desire to keep Texas State University, located in Hays County, out of Congressional District 21, which contains the University of Texas at Austin.[210]

Plaintiffs criticized the split that placed part of Cameron County into Congressional District 15. The State responded with credible evidence that Congressional District 15 extends into Cameron County in order to keep the city of Harlingen together in a single district. Plaintiffs

---

[209] *Id.* at 81 (explaining that Plan 1374C splits Comal County along a city council district line).

[210] *Id.* at 90-91.

castigated the division of Hidalgo County between Congressional District 15 and Congressional District 25. The State introduced testimony that Congressman Hinojosa asked that the cities of Mission and Edinburg be kept whole, which could be accomplished only by splitting Hidalgo County.[211] Plaintiffs criticized the Legislature for extending Congressional District 27 to include all of Nueces County and part of San Patricio County; under Plan 1151C, only half of Nueces County was included in Congressional District 27. The State introduced evidence that a state senator on the Redistricting Commission, Senator Luna, wanted to keep Nueces County and San Patricio County undivided in a single district. Although that was not feasible because of the need to achieve population balance, the Legislature was able to keep the port of Corpus Christi, located in Nueces County, in a single district with the port communities of San Patricio County.[212] The Legislature's primary map drawer, Bob Davis, and the sponsor of the redistricting bill in the State House of Representatives, Representative Phil King, provided credible testimony that the numerous decisions embodied in the location of each district line combined the broad political goal of increasing Republican seats with local political decisions that are the most traditional of districting criteria.[213]

---

[211] *Id.* at 89.

[212] In all, Plan 1374C split 122 cities and 14 Census Designated Places. By comparison, Plan 1151C split 132 cities and 15 Census Designated Places.

[213] *Cf. Theriot*, 185 F.3d at 485-86 (rejecting a claim of racial gerrymandering where map drawers testified that reapportionment was based on political negotiations).

The Supreme Court has focused on the specific features of a district that cause it to depart from compactness in assessing whether those features are justifiable on traditional districting grounds. In *Bush,* as here, the State attempted to justify its decisions on the traditional ground of partisan politics.[214] In that case, the Court found it significant that "the maps reveal that political considerations were subordinated to racial classification in the drawing of many of the most extreme and bizarre district lines."[215] The *Bush* Court found as clear evidence of the subordination of politics to race the fact that the State was willing, in the course of extending a noncompact tentacle engulfing a pocket of African-American voters, to include a large number of Republican voter tabulation districts in a congressional district ostensibly designed to maximize Democratic power.[216] In the present case, by contrast, the evidence did not reveal such internal inconsistencies. Instead, the Legislature's line-drawing decisions were primarily driven by the political goal of increasing Republican strength in Congressional District 23; the related political goal of ensuring that newly created Congressional District 25, as well as reconfigured Congressional Districts 15, 28, and 27, did not weaken Republican strength in adjacent Congressional District 21; a number of localized political considerations; and the overall need for a balanced population distribution.[217] Although the Legislature

---

[214] 517 U.S. at 959.

[215] *Id.* at 971.

[216] *Id.*

[217] *See Bush,* 517 U.S. at 964 (suggesting that the achievement of political goals, including incumbency protection, constitutes a traditional districting criterion); *Chen v. City of Houston,* 206 F.3d 502, 507

(Continued on following page)

clearly intended to create a majority Latino citizen voting age population district in Congressional District 25 and maintain Congressional Districts 15, 28, and 27 as majority Latino citizen voting age population districts, the evidence does not show that it subordinated all other traditional districting criteria to a scheme in which ethnicity predominated.[218] To the contrary, the evidence shows that many of the lines were drawn for such reasons as balancing population, keeping certain cities or areas intact in a district, and satisfying requests from state or federal legislators to keep certain areas together, or place universities in different districts.[219] The evidence also shows that the lines did not make twists, turns, or jumps that can be explained only as efforts to include Hispanics or exclude Anglos, or vice-versa. Plan 1374C does not reveal a subordination of traditional districting principles to ethnic considerations.

Plaintiffs urge that a derogation of traditional districting principles in Plan 1374C is evidenced by the fact that it

---

(5th Cir. 2000) (same); *Clark v. Putnam*, 293 F.3d 1261, 1266 (11th Cir. 2002) (same); *see also Shaw I*, 509 U.S. at 651 (citing *United Jewish Orgs. of Williamsburgh, Inc. v. Carey*, 430 U.S. 144, 168 (1977) (opinion of White, J., joined by Stevens and Rehnquist, J.J.)) (characterizing the achievement of population equality as a traditional districting principle).

[218] *See Bush*, 517 U.S. at 962 (noting that the drawing of majority-minority districts is not objectionable unless traditional districting criteria are subordinated to race).

[219] *Cf. Theriot*, 185 F.3d at 487-88 (holding that race was not the predominate factor in a reapportionment based on political negotiation, including incumbency protection, and limited by one-man-one-vote concerns and irregular geography).

links disparate communities in single districts, compromising the ability of the most impoverished and needy areas to obtain necessary representation. Plaintiffs complain that the new plan places border towns with large Hispanic populations in the same districts as Central Texas areas with large Hispanic populations, with ethnicity as their only common characteristic.

According to the Supreme Court, manifestations of a community of interest include, "for example, shared broadcast and print media, public transport infrastructure, and institutions such as schools and churches."[220] The district challenged in *Shaw I* was clearly not driven by communities of interest; the Court described the district as one that "winds in snakelike fashion through tobacco country, financial centers, and manufacturing areas" in an attempt to gather up "enclaves of black neighborhoods" and "even towns are divided."[221] And in *Miller,* because the challenged district reached out to include African-American pockets in several entirely separate urban communities, linked by narrow corridors to a sparsely populated and wholly rural core, the "social, political and economic makeup of the Eleventh District [told] a tale of disparity, not community."[222]

The "bacon-strip" districts of Plan 1374C, Congressional Districts 15, 25, and 28, include disparate communities of interest. Plaintiffs presented evidence of

---

[220] *Bush,* 517 U.S. at 964.

[221] *Shaw I,* 509 U.S. at 635-36 (internal citations omitted); *see Chen,* 206 F.3d at 512.

[222] 515 U.S. at 908.

differences in socio-economic status, education, employment, health, and other characteristics between Hispanics who live near Texas's southern border and those who reside in Central Texas. However, like the deviations from compactness, these deviations from the traditional districting principle of protecting communities of interest were necessary to meet the constitutional requirement of equal district populations in an area in which population is clustered at the southern tip and the center of the State. Plaintiffs' evidence has not demonstrated that the linking of disparate border and Central Texas Hispanic communities was caused by the factor of ethnicity, rather than the factors of geography and population distribution and the need to achieve equipopulosity.[223] Given the presumption in favor of legislative integrity,[224] we cannot say that the combination of communities of interest here provides circumstantial evidence of the predominance of ethnicity.

The record does not present evidence of statements by legislators or staff supporting the claim that ethnicity predominated in the redistricting process. To the contrary, the emails, statements, and other communications from those involved in the process reveal that politics predominated.[225] Similarly, the data the Legislature used in the districting process does not support a claim of unwarranted

---

[223] *Cf. Chen*, 206 F.3d at 513 (noting that, at least when relatively large districts are involved, the mere existence of socioeconomic variations within a district is generally not probative of the predominance of race or ethnicity in districting decisions).

[224] *Miller*, 515 U.S. at 915.

[225] Davis Test., Tr. File 11 at 85-125; King Test., Tr. File 12 at 135-40; Jackson Pls.' Ex. 136.

reliance on ethnicity to make the line-drawing decisions. In *Bush,* the Court condemned the use of census blocks as the fundamental unit for a redistricting plan because the use of such units allows a state to focus too heavily on race in drawing district lines.[226] In the present case, by contrast, the State presented undisputed testimony that the map drawers examined race at the block level in the South and West Texas districts on only a few occasions in order to avoid splitting minority communities.[227]

The Supreme Court has made it clear that a legislature may give consideration to race and ethnicity in the districting process, as long as those factors do not predominate and districting decisions are explainable on grounds other than race.[228] The districting decisions involved in Plan 1374C are best explained by Texas's geography and population distribution and its Legislature's predominately political intent. The record in this case does not show that ethnicity predominated or that the South and West Texas district boundaries in Plan 1374C cannot be explained except by ethnic considerations. Plaintiffs have not met their significant burden of demonstrating racial gerrymandering.[229]

---

[226] 517 U.S. at 961-62.

[227] Davis Test., Tr. File 11 at 92, File 12 at 27-28.

[228] *Hunt,* 526 U.S. at 546; *Bush,* 517 U.S. at 993 (O'Connor, J., concurring); *Miller,* 515 U.S. at 916.

[229] *See Bush,* 517 U.S. at 959.

VII

Congressional District 18 is a historically significant African-American majority district in Houston, Harris County, Texas. Its first representative was Congresswoman Barbara Jordan. Jordan was elected at the creation of the district in 1972 as one of the two first African-Americans elected to Congress from the South since Reconstruction and the first African-American elected to Congress from Texas. Congressional District 18 is currently represented by Congresswoman Sheila Jackson Lee. Congressional District 30 is also a historically significant district, the first African-American majority district in Dallas, Dallas County, Texas. Congresswoman Eddie Bernice Johnson represents Congressional District 30. Both Congresswomen Jackson Lee and Johnson provided helpful testimony in this case, adding their voices to those emphasizing that racial polarization and appeals to racial prejudice persist in Texas politics and political campaigns.

Plaintiffs Jackson Lee and Johnson, supported by the NAACP and other plaintiffs, criticize Plan 1374C as diluting the African-American voting strength in Congressional Districts 18 and 30. As to Congressional District 18, Plaintiffs claim that in order to create Congressional District 9 as an additional African-American opportunity district in Houston, Plan 1374C moved high turnout African-American voters out of Congressional District 18 and placed them in Congressional District 9. In Congressional District 18, according to Plaintiffs, those voters were replaced with what the NAACP characterized as "transient and Hispanic voters who are noted for their low

participation in elections."[230] Plaintiffs criticize Congressional District 30 in Plan 1374C on a similar ground. Plaintiffs assert that the plan removes from Congressional District 30 a predominately Anglo area from Irving, Texas and replaces it with an area of largely Hispanic voters from Congressional District 24 in Plan 1151C. Congresswoman Johnson criticized the effects on Congressional District 30 as removing an economically strong area from the district and combining areas of African-American and Hispanic voters, setting up a competition between them that could dilute African-American voting strength. Recognizing that both districts retain a strong African-American majority in Plan 1374C, Plaintiffs rely on projections of the relative growth of the Latino population in the years 2005 and 2010 to support the argument that dilution is threatened, if not present.

The evidence that Plaintiffs present does not support their claim of dilution, present or threatened. Congressional Districts 18 and 30 are effective African-American opportunity districts under Plan 1374C.[231] Plaintiffs' own population and voting data support this conclusion. In Plan 1374C, Congressional District 18 has an African-American voting age population of 40.3% and an African-American citizen voting age population of 48.3%. This is only slightly below the figures that were present in Plan 1151C, which had a Black voting age population of 42.1% and a Black citizen voting age population of 49.8%. Plaintiffs argue that Plan 1374C increases the number of

---

[230] Texas NAACP Pl.'s Post-Trial Brief at 27.

[231] Gaddie Report, Jackson Pls.' Ex. 141 at 13, 14; *see* Murray Report, Jackson Lee and Johnson Pls.' Ex. 27.

Hispanics and reduces the number of high-turnout African-American voters. The Hispanic citizen voting age population in Congressional District 18 under Plan 1374C is 19.6%, only slightly higher than it was under Plan 1151C (17.9%). And the percentage of Spanish-surnamed voters in Congressional District 18 under Plan 1374C in 2002 is 16%, only slightly higher than the 14.2% under Plan 1151C.[232] Plaintiffs' comparisons of voting patterns in the areas removed from and added to Congressional District 18 under Plan 1374C support the conclusion that the exchange does not dilute the strength of African-American voters in the district. In the U.S. Senate primary for 2002, which pitted African-American candidate Ron Kirk against Latino candidate Victor Morales, African-American candidate Kirk won by 78% in the area removed from the district, and 76% in the area added to the district.[233] In the 2002 general election, the African-American Democratic candidate received 78.8% of the vote in the area removed from the district and 65.8% in the area added to the district.[234] These changes are too slight to support the claim that the strength or status of Congressional District 18 as an effective African-American opportunity district, that has and will reliably elect the African-American candidate of choice, is diluted.

The projections of the population changes between 2000 and 2010 by Dr. Richard Murray, expert witness for Plaintiffs Jackson Lee and Johnson, do not alter this

---

[232] Jackson Pls.' Ex. 141 at Table 3.

[233] Jackson Lee and Johnson Pls.' Ex. 27 at 8, Table 6.

[234] *Id.*

conclusion.[235] Indeed, Dr. Murray's projections shed little light on the issue because while he projected the growth of African-American and Hispanic voting age population, he simply did not include any projections of Hispanic citizen voting age population. The failure to include this information makes his projections interesting but of little value to assessing any trend toward future dilution in the relevant period.

As to Congressional District 30, Congresswoman Johnson remained confident that the district would continue to send her to Congress and to elect other African-American candidates of choice. Again, the figures support her conclusion. In Congressional District 30, under Plan 1374C, the Black citizen voting age population is 50.6%, while the Hispanic citizen voting age population is 15.6%. This is only slightly less than the Black citizen voting age population (48.6%) and only slightly more than the Hispanic citizen voting age population (14.3%) in Plan 1151C. And in Congressional District 30 under Plan 1374C, the Spanish-surnamed voters in 2002 accounted for only 12.5% of registered voters. The comparison of vote patterns verifies the continuing strength of Congressional District 30 as an effective African-American opportunity district in Plan 1374C. In the 2002 Democratic primary runoff for the Senate, the African-American candidate of choice, Ron Kirk, received 64.2% of the vote in the area removed from Congressional District 30 and Victor Morales, the Latino candidate of choice, received 35.8% of the vote.[236] In the area added to Congressional District 30,

---

[235] *See id.* at 4-9.

[236] Jackson Lee and Johnson Pls.' Ex. 27 at 12, Table 9.

Ron Kirk received 61.9% of the vote and Victor Morales received 38.1% of the vote.[237] Again, the reduction in the votes received by the African-American candidate of choice is too slight to support any inference of dilution. And in the 2002 general election for the Senate, in the area removed from the district, Ron Kirk received 39% of the vote, while he received 61.9% of the total vote in the area added to the district.[238] Dr. Murray's population projections are no more useful in understanding the likely African-American voting strength of Congressional District 30 in 2005 and 2010 than they were for Congressional District 18.[239] Again, Dr. Murray neglects to include any analysis of the likely Hispanic citizen voting age population in the district in the future. He concludes that Congressional District 30 is an effective opportunity district for African-Americans now and offers no basis for believing that its status will change before the next decennial census.

The record, in short, offers no support for the dilution claim as to Congressional Districts 18 and 30. Rather, the arguments underscore that there is no cohesion between African-American and Latino voters in primary elections, particularly those that pit an African-American candidate against a Latino candidate. Although the congresswomen representing these districts ask this court to create districts that are almost exclusively African-American and to create a separate majority Latino citizen voting age population district in Dallas, there is no *Gingles* analysis

---

[237] *Id.*

[238] *Id.*

[239] *See id.* at 9-13.

to support this request and the record does not suggest that one could be provided. Plan 1374C does not violate § 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

VIII

For the foregoing reasons, we deny all relief requested by Plaintiffs. Judgment will be entered for Defendants.

Ward, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part.

I.

I join the court's opinion that the law does not preclude the State's Legislature from enacting a mid-decade redistricting plan following a court-ordered remedial plan such as the one enacted by the court in *Balderas v. State of Texas*. I understand the court's opinion to be limited to that question. I write separately to emphasize that it is one question to ask whether the law prohibits a state from enacting a mid-decade redistricting plan. It is quite another to ask whether a state may dictate electoral outcomes by using its Article I authority to thwart the Supreme Court's mandate that votes cast in a Congressional election be given as nearly equal weight as possible.

I do not read the Court's decisions in *U.S. Term Limits v. Thornton*, 514 U.S. 779 (1995) and *Cook v. Gralike*, 531 U.S. 510 (2001) quite as narrowly as my colleagues. Admittedly, those cases rejected state laws which sought to add to the Qualifications Clause either directly as in *Term Limits*, or indirectly, through pejorative ballot descriptions as in *Cook*. From that standpoint they are

easier cases than this one to decide. Nonetheless, these decisions underscored that "the Framers understood the Elections Clause as a grant of authority to issue procedural regulations, and not as a source of power to dictate electoral outcomes, to favor or disfavor a class of candidates, or to evade important constitutional restraints." *Term Limits,* 514 U.S. at 833-34; *Cook,* 531 U.S. at 523.

Although the state's authority to issue procedural regulations is broad, at some point a state exceeds the power granted to it by the Elections Clause. Modern technology effectively allows a state to dictate electoral outcomes and to favor or disfavor a class of candidates by enabling extreme partisan gerrymandering. I join the court's decision that the Elections Clause does not prohibit mid-decade redistricting and note that there may be legitimate state interests advanced by the effort. Whether the present exercise is a "legitimate" state interest may ultimately be resolved by the Supreme Court in *Vieth v. Jubelirer,* and it seems to me that the Elections Clause would be equally offended by a state's abuse of its authority regardless of whether such abuse occurred in the beginning, the middle, or the end, of a decade following the release of the census data. It is not the timing of the endeavor that creates problems, it is the fact of it.

As noted by the court in *Balderas,* partisan gerrymandering reflects a "fundamental distrust of voters." As in other contexts, extreme partisan gerrymandering leads to a system in which the representatives choose their constituents, rather than vice-versa. I join the court's judgment on the partisan gerrymandering issue given the high bar set in the equal protection context, but I do not join the court's discussion of the issue under Section III.B. That discussion implies that extreme partisan gerrymandering is

okay as long as one party can reverse the tide when it takes over the statewide offices. Dr. Alford's report and testimony provides a detailed analysis of the effects of the extreme partisan gerrymander enacted in this case and the dangers of ignoring these issues. As Dr. Alford explains, these dangers include the encouragement of race-based redistricting. At present, we lack the legal precedent to sustain this challenge under either the Equal Protection Clause or the Elections Clause. The present case fails under the standards announced in *Davis v. Bandemer* and its progeny – even though those standards may or may not ultimately control the disposition of this case, given its timing and that of the arguments in *Vieth v. Jubelirer.*

I join much of the balance of the opinion. I agree that the plaintiffs have not prevailed on their equal protection claims and I agree that no violation of the Voting Rights Act has been shown with respect to Districts 18 and 30. On the remaining § 2 issues, I dissent from the court's opinion related to the issues surrounding District 23 and I concur in the court's judgment insofar as it rejects the claims surrounding District 24 and the claims surrounding Districts 1, 2, 4, 9, 10, 11 & 17. I will first examine the claims related to District 23 and then visit the issue of the influence districts.

II.

A.

The state action in this case unlawfully dilutes the strength of the Latino voters residing in former District 23. To that end, the majority errs when it holds that the State may permissibly "trade off" the rights of minority voters in former District 23 for those in new District 25, a

district created to assist the state with its pre-clearance efforts. I would enjoin the operation of Plan 1374C, permit the Legislature to remedy the violations, and, given the amount of the state that would likely be affected by the changes, order that the elections be conducted under Plan 1151C.

B.

For a statute whose purpose "is to prevent discrimination in the exercise of the electoral franchise and to foster our transformation to a society that is no longer fixated on race," *Georgia v. Ashcroft,* 123 S.Ct. 2498, 2517 (2003), the Voting Rights Act receives a curious interpretation in this case. The State's heavy reliance on the flexibility given to it by *Ashcroft* might carry the day with me if Plan 1374C bore any resemblance to the redistricting plan at issue there. It does not.

To begin, the state senate plan at issue in *Ashcroft* was overwhelmingly supported by the minority legislators. Just the opposite is true in this case. Georgia's plan sought to *maximize* the statewide influence of black voters in the State of Georgia. The plan unpacked districts in which blacks constituted a super-majority and (1) maintained the number of majority-minority districts and, at the same time, (2) *increased* the number of "influence districts" in which blacks would be expected to exert a significant – if not decisive – force in the electoral process. Georgia did so by placing black voters into districts that were likely to lean Democratic in the election returns. Because black voters in Georgia usually supported Democratic candidates, the creation of these influence districts made it likely that blacks could exert more influence in the election process

and, correspondingly, increased the likelihood that the elected candidate would be responsive to the black communities' needs. The distinct but related concepts of substantive versus descriptive representation were at issue.

Georgia argued that, although the plan made the super-majority districts somewhat less "safe," its plan as a whole increased the political clout of blacks statewide and therefore did not result in a retrogression in African-American voters' effective exercise of the electoral franchise. *Ashcroft* held that "[i]n order to maximize the electoral success of a minority group, a State may choose to create a certain number of 'safe' districts, in which it is highly likely that minority voters will be able to elect the candidate of their choice. Alternatively, a State may choose to create a greater number of districts in which it is likely – although perhaps not quite as likely as under the benchmark plan – that minority voters will be able to elect candidates of their choice." *Ashcroft*, 123 S.Ct. at 2511. The Court explained that the extent to which a plan created coalition and influence districts were important considerations in the preclearance inquiry. Ultimately, the Court held that the three-judge court, by circumscribing its focus on the unpacked districts, had engaged in too narrow a review of whether the redistricting plan would lead to retrogression at the statewide level. The majority reads *Ashcroft* to give the state flexibility to comply with its obligations under the Voting Rights Act. This is true, to a point. *Ashcroft* was a § 5 case and its language certainly permits the states a certain amount of latitude in determining how to maximize minority voter influence. But I do not read *Ashcroft* – a decision designed to foster minority participation in the political process – to permit the state

to dismantle an existing opportunity district for political purposes so long as the loss is made up somewhere else. Nor do I read *Ashcroft* to make it harder to prove claims under § 2. There was no § 2 question decided in *Ashcroft*. Indeed, one of the grounds Georgia asserted in support of preclearance was the plan's compliance with § 2 of the Voting Rights Act. It is hard for me to believe that the Supreme Court intended to make it harder to prove a § 2 claim by endorsing a statewide approach that the Court believed could have the effect of maximizing minority influence.

Ashcroft recognizes the value of safe districts, coalition districts, and influence districts as means to increase minority voting opportunities and political influence. Make no mistake about it: Despite the State's protestations to the contrary, the changes to District 23 under Plan 1374C were not intended to increase minority voter participation either by strengthening the district or "unpacking" the minority voters into adjoining districts to maximize the overall political strength of Hispanics. These changes were designed to crush these minority voters' participation in the political process.

C.

Under Plan 1000C, in effect after the 1990 census, as well as under its successor, Plan 1151C, District 23 was a protected Latino opportunity district. The district had a Latino citizen voting age population in excess of 50% and was designed to offer Latino voters the opportunity to elect candidates of choice. Under Plan 1000C, the district boasted a Spanish Surname Voter Registration of 53.3%. And under Plan 1151C, that figure was increased to 55.3%. The *Balderas* court implicitly recognized that

District 23 under Plan 1151C was a protected minority opportunity district when it maintained only six Latino majority citizen voting age districts. A review of the statistical package for Plan 1000C reveals that District 23 was one of those six districts. All six (and only those six) had a Spanish Surname Voter Registration in excess of 50%.

As it was configured under Plan 1151C, District 23 offered Latino voters the *opportunity* to elect their candidate of choice. In the present case, Dr. Gaddie, the State's expert, testified that District 23 under Plan 1151C performed for Latino voters in 2002 by electing the Latino candidate of choice in 13 out of 15 statewide elections. He also testified that a district which elects the Latino-preferred candidate of choice in such numbers offers Latinos the opportunity to elect their candidate of choice. Dr. Engstrom, the GI Forum plaintiffs' expert, reached a similar conclusion: He analyzed racially contested statewide elections from 1994 to 2002 and concluded that District 23 under Plan 1151C elected the preferred Latino candidate in 5 out of 8 races and offers Latino voters the opportunity to elect candidates of choice. Dr. Lichtman, called by the Jackson plaintiffs, arrived at the same conclusion.

When it enacted Plan 1374C, the State altered the racial composition of District 23 not to *increase* the likelihood that the Latino community therein would elect a candidate of its choice, but to ensure it would have no practical influence on the congressional election. All of the experts agree that Plan 1374C alters District 23 to the point where it has no hope of functioning as an effective Latino opportunity district. There is no dispute that the State altered District 23 to help re-elect Congressman Henry Bonilla because it predicted that if Latinos continued to constitute a majority of the citizen voting age

population in District 23, Congressman Bonilla would ultimately lose. The evidence is that he is not the Latino candidate of choice. The 2002 congressional election foreshadowed the need for this change: Congressman Bonilla received only 8% of the Hispanic vote. Spanish surname voter registration has correspondingly risen during the same time period and, until the Legislature passed Plan 1374C, had grown to approximately 55% for the district.

The State's solution to this political problem was brutal, yet simple: destroy the opportunity district. The state did so by cracking a cohesive Hispanic community out of Webb County and taking in Anglos from the Texas Hill Country to build a district in which the Hispanic community will not be able to influence the outcome of the election. The majority's characterization of new District 23 as a Latino "influence district" is therefore in error. An influence district is a district in which the minority population carries enough political weight potentially to be the swing vote in the election and command the attention of the representative. A competitive district is the touchstone. Not so with new District 23. The Hispanic citizenship figures have been reduced by so great a margin that the Hispanics in District 23, although having the ability to control the Democratic primary, will lose the general election every time. The undisputed regression analyses confirm this. Contrary to the majority's characterization, the district's very design ensures a lack of competitiveness and a corresponding lack of responsiveness.

There are, however, a total of 359,000 Latinos who continue to reside in new District 23. They object to the State's dismantling of their opportunity district under § 2. The question presented is whether a state can, consistent with § 2, intentionally dilute a minority group's voting

rights in an existing opportunity district to obtain a partisan advantage while, at the same time, offset the effects by creating a new district in another part of the state. The majority's answer is that *Ashcroft* and *Johnson v. De Grandy,* 512 U.S. 997 (1994), permit this sort of line-drawing. I disagree.

D.

Contrary to the majority, I do not read *Ashcroft* or *De Grandy* to encourage the sort of voting rights swap meet put into play by Plan 1374C. The majority effectively reads *Ashcroft's § 5* holding and *De Grandy* to countenance violations of *§ 2* in one part of the state, so long as those violations are "offset" by the creation of new minority opportunity districts elsewhere in the state. The State conceded that this was its position in response to questions from the bench during closing arguments. By its terms, of course, *Ashcroft* says nothing about a state plan which unlawfully dilutes the minority strength in one part of the state and seeks to "offset" that dilution by the creation of a new minority opportunity district in a different part of the state – one of Georgia's contentions was the plan's compliance with § 2 required pre-clearance under § 5.

That *Ashcroft* did not endorse the approach suggested by the State is not surprising. The Court had already answered this question once in *De Grandy* and again in its *Shaw* cases. In *De Grandy,* the state proposed a *per se* rule that proportionality was a safe harbor, insulating any reapportionment plan which provided proportional representation from a Section 2 challenge. In rejecting that proposal, the Court stated that the state's argument rested on an "unexplored premise of highly suspect validity: that

in a given case, the rights of some minority voters under § 2 may be traded off against the rights of other members of the same minority class." 512 U.S. at 1019. Later, in *Shaw v. Hunt*, 517 U.S. 899, 917 (1996) (*Shaw II*), the Court made its views even more explicit:

> If a § 2 violation is proved for a particular area, it flows from the fact that individuals in this area "have less opportunity than other members of the electorate to participate in the political process and to elect representatives of their choice." 42 U.S.C. § 1973(b). The vote-dilution injuries suffered by these persons are not remedied by creating a safe majority-black district somewhere else in the State. For example, if a geographically compact, cohesive minority population lives in south-central to southeastern North Carolina, as the Justice Department's objection letter suggested, District 12 that spans the Piedmont Crescent would not address that § 2 violation. The black voters of the south-central to southeastern region would still be suffering precisely the same injury that they suffered before District 12 was drawn. District 12 would not address the professed interest of relieving the vote dilution, much less be narrowly tailored to accomplish the goal.
>
> Arguing, as appellees do and the District Court did, that the State may draw the district anywhere derives from a misconception of the vote-dilution claim. To accept that the district may be placed anywhere implies that the claim, and hence the coordinate right to an undiluted vote (to cast a ballot equal among voters), belongs to the minority as a group and not to its individual members. It does not.

Although I recognize that "States retain broad discretion in drawing districts to comply with the mandate of § 2," *Shaw II,* 517 U.S. at 917 n.9 (citing *Voinovich v. Quilter,* 507 U.S. 146, 156-57 (1993); and *Growe v. Emison,* 507 U.S. 25, 32-37 (1993)), I do not read the Court's cases to mean that the "effects" test of § 2, if satisfied, may be defended against by pointing to a political agenda in the affected portion of the jurisdiction and compensation, over the long haul, to other members of the injured group residing elsewhere in the jurisdiction. *De Grandy* rejected the state's proposed safe harbor rule precisely because it encouraged what happened in this case. The court said: " . . . we reject the safe harbor rule because of a tendency the State would itself certainly condemn, *a tendency to promote and perpetuate efforts to devise majority minority districts even in circumstances where they may not be necessary to achieve equal political and electoral opportunity.*" *De Grandy,* 512 U.S. at 1019-20 (emphasis added). New District 25 falls squarely within the scope of this statement.

In this case, the State's redistricting effort mirrors precisely what *De Grandy* cautioned against. The fundamental flaw in the majority's approach is that it fails to appreciate that the Latino districts created in Plan 1374C are not in "the same area" as the *Gingles* districts have been located historically. In the past, the Latino groups have enjoyed participation in the six *Gingles* districts located in Plan 1000C and in Plan 1151C. Although there are still six Latino opportunity districts in Plan 1374C, those new districts take in quite different geography and population. The State took in, geographically, 10 additional counties and portions of 4 others which span an area of at least 8,500 square miles. The State also took in

more than 651,000 additional persons. To accomplish its goals, the state was forced to create new District 25 which reaches from the border in excess of three hundred miles north to include Hispanic population in Travis County.

In its effort to validate Plan 1374C, the majority first tells us that District 25 was created "[t]o avoid retrogression under Section 5." Quite correctly, the majority recognizes that the changes to District 23 resulted in the dilution of the Latino vote therein. But then, when confronted with the language of *Shaw* and *De Grandy* which prohibits exactly this sort of trade-off, the majority explains that the state enjoys the flexibility under *De Grandy* to draw *Gingles* districts in a different way, so long as it creates a total of six (but only six) districts in which Latinos may elect a candidate of choice. But *Gingles* addresses liability under § 2. No one suggests the State needed to create new District 25 to guard against a potential vote dilution challenge by a resourceful if not aspiring coalition of Latinos living in Travis County and those living in the *colonias* over 300 miles away near the Texas-Mexico border. At yet another place in its opinion, the majority implicitly repudiates this very species of § 2 liability when it holds to be non-compact the GI Forum's demonstration districts – even though all have better compactness scores than new District 15 in Plan 1374C.

The majority blurs the distinction between the State's flexibility to comply with its *procedural* obligations under § 5 and its flexibility to comply with its *remedial* obligations under § 2. The majority misses this distinction because it fails to appreciate the fact that the Latino

opportunity districts in Plan 1374C take in different populations and geography than before.[1] The majority's initial reaction to new District 25 was of course correct: the State created new District 25 to "offset" the loss of old District 23 for § 5 preclearance purposes. But the underlying forces driving the need for new District 25 are inconsistent with *Ashcroft*'s rationale. At issue in *Ashcroft* was Georgia's decision to unpack black opportunity districts to *increase* the statewide political might of the minority voters. Central to *Ashcroft's* willingness to provide states with flexibility was the Court's recognition that the plan was intended (or at least contended to be intended) to *increase* minority voting strength statewide. Unlike the efforts in *Ashcroft,* the dilution of Latino voting strength in District 23 was not designed to *maximize* Latino voting strength statewide, and, as noted, the majority's characterization of District 23 as continuing on as some sort of an Hispanic *influence* district is error. Under the majority's theory of influence districts, we are left to conclude that Congressman Bonilla will be *more* responsive to the Latino community now that they constitute over 10% *less* of his constituency.

This turns *Ashcroft* on its head. District 23 is designed so that the Hispanic population therein *will not* influence the outcome of the elections and *will not* tend to make the elected representative more responsive to the community's needs. The only thing the Hispanic community in District

---

[1] To be sure, under any configuration, the geography spanned by the districts in South and West Texas is vast. But some of the districts include large areas to capture population; new District 25 is noncompact because of its need, under § 5, to capture *Hispanic* population.

23 will influence is the total population of the district to meet "one person, one vote" requirements. The state action was designed to increase Henry Bonilla's chance of electoral success at the expense of District 23's dissatisfied Hispanic voters. To suggest that those minority voters cannot prevail on a dilution claim under § 2 elevates the State's political agenda over the individual rights of Latino voters in former District 23. For these reasons, I would reject the State's efforts to trade the rights of Latinos in old District 23 for those in new District 25.

E.

As stated, it is my opinion that the State violated § 2 when it dismantled old District 23 and replaced it with new District 25. If the majority is correct that the State could draw new District 25 to comply with its *Gingles* obligations, then the majority is confronted at once with the GI Forum plaintiffs' dilution claim. These plaintiffs claim that Plan 1374C dilutes the statewide strength of Hispanic voters because it fails to create a seventh Latino majority district. The majority, however, rejects the GI Forum plaintiffs' claims for several reasons. First, the majority opines that the proposed districts will not be effective. Second, the majority holds that the districts are not compact. Third, the majority determines that *De Grandy* proportionality tends to show that Plan 1374C will not have the effect of unlawfully diluting the Latino vote. Finally, the majority suggests that *Balderas* rejected the identical claim. None of these reasons is persuasive.

1.

In this case, if the State is permitted or required to draw *Gingles* remedial districts into the new areas of the state and in the manner in which it did, the GI Forum plaintiffs assert that the *Gingles* preconditions suggest that seven majority Latino districts should be created. I agree. The evidence is undisputed that, under Plan 1385C, sponsored by the GI Forum plaintiffs, Latino voters constitute the majority of citizen voting age population in seven congressional districts in South and Central Texas. *See Valdespino v. Alamo Heights Independent School Dist.*, 168 F.3d 848 (5th Cir. 1999) (interpreting *Gingles* to require consideration of citizen voting age population or "CVAP"); *Campos v. City of Houston*, 113 F.3d 544, 548 (5th Cir. 1997) (same). These districts are District 15 (63.3% CVAP), District 16 (68.0% CVAP), District 20 (58.0% CVAP), District 23 (57.2% CVAP), District 25 (58.4% CVAP), District 27 (59.9% CVAP), and District 28 (50.3% CVAP).

The majority resists the GI Forum plaintiffs' demonstration plan because it believes the plan does not provide seven "effective" Latino districts. I disagree. The majority places great emphasis on the fact that the Hispanic CVAP of District 28 in Plan 1385C is only 50.3%. Be that as it may, under the evidence submitted by the GI Forum plaintiffs, the district elected the Latino candidate in 8 out of 8 elections since 1994, and the vote for the Latino candidate in the most recent elections, 2002, exceeded 55% of the total vote in each of the four elections. *See, e.g.* GI Forum plaintiffs' Exh. 131; (Tr. 12/16/03 a.m. at 29-30). On balance, District 28 is almost identical in performance to District 28 in the State's plan 1374C despite the fact that, in District 1374C, District 28 has an Hispanic CVAP of 56.2%. By contrast, the weakest district in the GI Forum

plaintiffs' demonstration map is District 23, which elected the Latino candidate of choice in 5 out of 8 elections at margins nearly identical to those which led the *Balderas* court to conclude that District 23 was a protected minority opportunity district. Each of the remaining Latino districts in Plan 1385C elects the Latino candidates to office in 8 out of 8 elections. Viewed in the light of these election returns as opposed to simply looking at the CVAP content or any other single statistic, all of these districts perform, in terms of winning elections, at least as well as their counterparts in Plan 1374C.

The majority also relies on the testimony of experts called by other parties, including Dr. Jerry Polinard, an expert witness called by the Valdez-Cox plaintiffs. The majority reads Dr. Polinard's testimony to suggest that in all cases a higher Hispanic CVAP number is necessary to find an effective Hispanic opportunity district. The majority is wrong. In the first place, as set forth above, Dr. Engstrom's analysis of the election results tell a different story. Moreover, Dr. Polinard was in fact testifying about the effects of the districts as drawn in Plan 1374C, not Plan 1385C. What Dr. Polinard said with respect to numbers is:

> I have no magic number. That's going to vary – vary by District. I will state the obvious, that if the Spanish surname voter registration percentage goes up, the opportunity goes up.
>
> I think you become comfortable with opportunity districts once you break into those 60 percent ranges.

(Tr. 12/16/03 p.m. at 50-51).

The majority also cites the testimony of the State's expert with respect to new District 15 to reject as effective District 28 in the demonstration plan. In terms of actual election results, however, new District 15 appears to perform *worse* than the GI Forum plaintiffs' proposed District 28, despite the fact that new District 15 has a higher Hispanic CVAP than proposed District 28.

The truth of the matter is that the effectiveness of a minority opportunity district will vary by the district. A expert might find, for example, a need for a greater Hispanic CVAP in a district ranging from Travis County to the border and covering three or four media markets than would be needed in a district that is somewhat more compact. Under the evidence, all of the districts in Plan 1385C have the numbers to make them effective Latino opportunity districts.

This might be a closer call if the demographic evidence were otherwise. A showing that Latino population growth and voter registration was on the decline might counsel a court to conclude that gains over the short run might be offset by anticipated losses in the end. That is not our record. The evidence establishes that the Latino voter registration as well as overall population growth is *rising*. Over the course of the decade, the only conclusion to be drawn from this evidence is that Latino voting strength in these districts will become stronger, not weaker. The GI Forum plaintiffs have established that their proposed districts would be effective.

2.

The majority also rejects the GI Forum plaintiffs' contention that their districts are "compact." But under

the objective compactness scores, several of the GI Forum plaintiffs' demonstration districts are, on balance, more compact than those in Plan 1374C. Although a few are worse, none of the districts scores worse than District 15 in Plan 1374C. Under the demonstration plan, 5 of the proposed districts have better "perimeter to area" scores than their counterparts in Plan 1374C. None of the districts in Plan 1385C have a perimeter to area score as high as District 15 in Plan 1374C. Under the smallest circle measure, three of the demonstration districts score better, one scores the same, and none is, again, as high as District 15 in Plan 1374C.

The majority disregards these scores, saying the comparison "understates the unusual shapes of the proposed demonstration districts." But it is the majority who overstates the significance of the "unusual" shapes of the districts. Focusing in on the "look" of the map as opposed to the objective scores and population centers, the majority says that District 25 virtually "bisects" District 23 in the demonstration plan. Viewed in the context of a redistricting plan, however, the two districts make perfect sense. District 23 strives to include the border communities of interest along the Rio Grande and, at the same time, retains over 99% of the City of Laredo – a major border population center – in District 23. The portions of District 25 which allegedly "bisect" District 23 are actually the boundaries of Dimmitt County, the total population of which is 10,248. The population of Laredo, 99% retained in District 23, is 176,576. The GI Forum plaintiffs' demonstration plan is, on balance, more compact than the pertinent portions of Plan 1374C.

3.

The majority's principal answer to the GI Forum plaintiffs is that Plan 1374C provides Latinos the opportunity to elect congressional candidates in substantial proportion to their share of the relevant population as a whole under *Johnson v. De Grandy.* I disagree.

a.

In *De Grandy,* the Court noted:

> If the three *Gingles* factors may not be isolated as sufficient, standing alone, to prove dilution in every multimember districting challenge, *a fortiori* they must not be when the challenge goes to a series of single-member districts, where dilution may be more difficult to grasp. Plaintiffs challenging single-member districts may claim, not total submergence, but partial submergence; not the chance for some electoral success in place of none, but the chance for more success in place of some. When the question thus comes down to the reasonableness of drawing a series of district lines in one combination of places rather than another, judgments about inequality may become closer calls.

512 U.S. at 1012-13.

Under *De Grandy,* proportionality is one factor to be considered in assessing the totality of circumstances to determine whether unlawful vote dilution has occurred under § 2. *Id.* at 1022. "Proportionality" in this sense involves a comparison between (1) the percentage share of legislative districts in which the population of the protected class has a majority and (2) the protected class's percentage of the relevant population. Proportionality is

one factor to be considered, and it does not create a safe harbor precluding § 2 liability when present, nor does it impose *per se* § 2 liability when absent.

b.

Proportionality does not compel the rejection of the GI Forum plaintiffs' claims in this case. Because of the procedural posture in *De Grandy,* the Court reserved the question whether proportionality should be measured on a statewide basis or by focusing on a smaller area of the jurisdiction at issue. *De Grandy,* 512 U.S. at 1022 ("[w]e have no occasion to decide which frame of reference should have been used if the parties had not apparently agreed in the District Court on the appropriate geographical scope for analyzing the alleged § 2 violation and devising its remedy."). Other courts have struggled with the question, but many have assessed proportionality by focusing on the nature of the specific Voting Rights Act claims at issue.[2]

---

[2] *Old Person v. Brown* did not reach the question because proportionality was lacking under either a statewide or a more narrow geographic scope. 312 F.3d 1036, 1044-46 (9th Cir.2002) ("Our holding that proportionality analysis could not here be limited to the districts of the plaintiffs' residence does not require us to choose between the state or the four counties as frame of reference. In either case, there is a lack of proportionality"). And, the court in *Rural West Tennessee African-American Affairs Council v. Sundquist,* adopted plaintiffs' proposed geographic scope when vote dilution claim focused on particular area of state. 209 F.3d 835, 844 (6th Cir. 2000). *African American Voting Rights Legal Defense Fund v. Villa* measured proportionality of a citywide apportionment plan using the entire city, noting "[w]e also believe that the district court's focus upon the entire city of St. Louis rather than upon the five central corridor wards was consistent with *Johnson*. . . . We agree that *Johnson* stands for the proposition that the proper geographic scope for the comparison is the scope that is pleaded in the complaint and subjected to proof." 54 F.3d 1345 (8th Cir. 1995). Finally,

(Continued on following page)

Under the facts of the present case, *De Grandy* proportionality should be measured by comparing the number of effective Latino congressional districts to the Latino percentage of the relevant statewide population. It is true that the GI Forum plaintiffs propose their Latino districts in the South and West Texas areas; however, it is equally the case that the GI Forum plaintiffs attack the operation of Plan 1374C because of its impact and its overall effect on the Latino voters in the state as a whole. They did not limit their challenge to the effect of Plan 1374C to the areas in South and Central Texas. An integral part of the claim is Plan 1374C's failure to maintain districts *in other parts of the state* in which minority communities might play an influential if not outcome determinative role in the general elections to increase the likelihood that the elected candidate will respond favorably to the minority communities' needs.

The State apparently agreed with this approach until the evidence was in and it became apparent there was a problem under § 2 with 1374C. The State's pretrial submissions addressed proportionality on a statewide basis. In particular, the State's trial brief addressed *De Grandy* proportionality and represented, misleadingly, that proportionality was met under Plan 1374C, because Hispanics "would have a *majority of the population* in 25% of the districts." Revised State Defendants' Trial Brief, filed

---

in *Campuzano v. Illinois State Board of Elections,* the court stated "[f]or a plan to provide minority voters equal participation in the political process, it must generally provide a number of 'effective' majority-minority districts that are substantially proportionate to the minority's share of the state's population." 200 F.Supp.2d 905, 909 (N.D. Ill. 2002).

December 3, 2003, at 39 (emphasis added).[3] It was not until after the close of the evidence that the State, or anyone else, contended that proportionality should not be assessed statewide.

There is no risk that assessing proportionality on a statewide basis will lead to an over-representation of Latinos in Congress. For instance, there is no evidence tending to prove that Latinos elsewhere in the state (*e.g.*, the panhandle, Dallas/Fort Worth, or East Texas) constitute a reasonably compact effective voting majority such that they could in the future assert a Section 2 violation in those parts of the state and require the creation of yet additional *Gingles* districts. Such evidence might require the court to assess proportionality on a smaller scale. *Rural West,* 209 F.3d at 844 ("The State complains that by allowing the plaintiffs to define the frame of reference for their § 2 claim, we will enable future litigants to carve up successively smaller areas of the State until they are able to maximize the number of majority-minority legislative districts – a result not countenanced by the Voting Rights Act [but] as the district court pointed out, however, the *Gingles* preconditions operate to prevent just the sort of limitlessly small 'reverse gerrymander' whose specter the State raises here."). In this case, however, the claim is that Plan 1374C dilutes the statewide voting strength of Latinos. That is the proper geographic scope by which to measure *De Grandy* proportionality.

---

[3] This statement is misleading precisely because *De Grandy* proportionality examines the ratio of CVAP majority districts to the share of the relevant population.

c.

So measured, Latinos constitute 32% of the total population and 29% of the voting age population in the State of Texas. *De Grandy* proportionality thus suggests that Latinos should comprise an effective voting majority, depending on whether one uses voting age or total population figures, in possibly nine or ten such districts. Under either measure, Plan 1374C fails to provide proportional representation to Latinos. Latinos enjoy the ability to elect representatives of their choice in only six districts: Districts 15, 16, 20, 25, 27 and 28. As a result, Plan 1374C fails to provide proportional representation.

The majority concludes that proportionality should be assessed on the basis of the minority group's percentage of the *citizen* voting age population. The majority overlooks that this question arises in the context of the apportionment of seats to the United States Congress. The seats are apportioned according to total population. From 1990-2000, the Latino growth in Texas accounted for more than 60% of the state's total population. The state thus enjoys the benefit of the total Latino population through an increase in its Anglo congressional delegation, but at the same time seeks to restrict the Latino's opportunity to elect to the fewest number of districts. Latinos are thus counted one way for apportionment purposes, but another when it comes to equal opportunity to participate in the political process. Stated another way, the state seeks the maximum use of the Latino population to gain power but seeks to minimize the sharing of power with the Latinos by using a more restrictive measure.

d.

Even assuming the correctness of the majority's approach, however, 6 districts out of 7 remains at the low end of rough proportionality. For reasons that are apparent from this record, the majority errs when it rejects the § 2 claims by relying on rough proportionality. I would ascribe far less weight to the proportionality issue given the circumstances under which the present case comes to us. We must remember that the State is having to defend this claim because it made the conscious choice to dismantle a minority opportunity district to thwart the growing Latino dissatisfaction with an incumbent Congressman. Just when it became apparent that District 23 was becoming more effective for the class it was intended to protect, the State intentionally altered it. The State thus placed itself in this position and the related position of having to create a new Latino opportunity district to meet a retrogression concern. Although the majority concludes this action is permitted by *De Grandy,* that case rejected a safe harbor rule precisely because such a rule would encourage states to do what Texas did: create an "offsetting" district where none was necessary and substitute one group's voting rights for another.

The weight ascribed to proportionality by the majority allows the State to mask its efforts to thwart the policies underlying the Voting Rights Act. To illustrate, suppose that new District 15 in Plan 1374C fails to perform and does not elect a candidate of choice for Latinos. Suppose further that over the course of the next few years, the Latino community mobilizes and puts pressure on the incumbent. To use *De Grandy* to permit the State at that stage to dismantle District 15 and create a new district somewhere else has a tendency to perpetuate the legacy of

discrimination, not to thwart it. Our record, and the State's action directed toward old District 23, is no different.

4.

Finally, the majority suggests that the *Balderas* court rejected this identical claim. The *Balderas* court did not. It is ironic that the State finds comfort in a remedial order that the Legislature rejected as controlling. Although I agree that the State has the authority to enact a redistricting plan, that new plan must stand or fall on its own merit, and not on any language of the *Balderas* remedial order – an order which must be read in context of Plan 1151C as a whole and which did not purport to address the merits of Plan 1374C. *Balderas* drew a remedial plan without the benefit of either the controlling citizen voting age population data or the most recent election returns. Those data are now available. Under those figures, seven districts may be drawn in which Latino voters will have the opportunity to elect their candidates of choice to Congress.

Balderas was primarily motivated by the desire to meet the Supreme Court's holding that a federal court should draw a remedial plan bearing in mind the requirements of the Voting Rights Act. The remedial order was thus forced to straddle the requirements of § 2 and § 5. At that time, prior to *Ashcroft,* a compelling argument could be made that a reduction in the overall Latino voting strength in any of the particular districts would have worked a retrogression prohibited by § 5. One of the forces driving the *Balderas* court's rejection of a seventh Latino district in the Central and South Texas regions was that

very concern. But the Attorney General has concluded, at least as to Plan 1374C, that an increase to the relevant geographic and population locations to accommodate six Latino districts, coupled with a corresponding reduction in the strength of District 15, will not lead to a retrogression of the minority group's effective exercise of the electoral franchise. It is incumbent upon us, therefore, to assess whether, by embracing that increased geographic area and drawing new districts, the State has drawn its districts in a way that will dilute the strength of the Latino vote therein.

The state is trying to have its cake and eat it too. The *Balderas* court found no vote dilution based on the totality of the circumstances then before it. The *Balderas* court expressly noted that its remedial plan increased the Latino voting strength in District 24 and created a minority opportunity district in District 25 and, in doing so, hardly left "a bleak terrain" for minority voting opportunities. Similarly, under Plan 1151C, Latino voters enjoyed substantial influence over the outcome of the elections in, at a minimum, Districts 10, 11 and 17 which influence, in turn, increased the likelihood that the elected candidates from those districts would be responsive to the needs of the minority communities. The presence in 1151C of districts in which the candidates are responsive to the needs of the minority community is a relevant consideration under the *Zimmer* factors. Under the totality of the circumstances, the failure to create additional opportunities did not lead to a dilution in statewide Latino voting strength. Section 2 is concerned with effects, and the State is unable to point to the presence of these minority influence districts to counterbalance its failure to create a seventh Latino majority-minority district. The State

cannot rely on the *Balderas* order to overcome this particular Section 2 challenge any more than the plaintiffs can rely on it to defeat the Legislature's ability to redistrict mid-decade. *Balderas* therefore stands as no opposition to the GI Forum plaintiffs' Section 2 claim.

III.

My opinion that the State violated § 2 when it dismantled old District 23 and replaced it with new District 25 renders it unnecessary to assess whether the "bacon strip" districts violate the principles set forth in *Shaw v. Reno* and its progeny.[4] Restructuring of the South and Central Texas districts is necessary to remedy that § 2 violation. It is doubtful that the court could, consistent with *Upham v. Seamon,* simply remedy the areas adjoining District 23, without treading on the state's policy as reflected overall in Plan 1374C. It is possible that any new configuration would cure any *Shaw* issues. For present purposes, it is enough for me to embrace the wisdom of Dr. Alford's opinion that any *Shaw* issues present in South and Central Texas under Plan 1374C resulted from the state's own action in altering District 23 for political purposes. The ripple effect of changes to this area of the map, however, would likely be felt across a large portion of the state. *E.g., Abrams v. Johnson,* 521 U.S. 74, 86 (1997). Given the primary schedule, and the evidence in the record about the difficulties of conducting the elections even under the plan as enacted by the State, I would grant

[4] I agree that District 29 in Houston is not subject to such a challenge.

the Legislature the opportunity to cure these defects and order the elections to be held under Plan 1151C, a plan that is beyond dispute a legal one.

IV.

This is not an easy case. My colleagues' concerns with interfering with legislative and political prerogatives are not without force, and I agree that politics motivated many of the decisions involved in the case. As difficult as the case is, however, I am unable to agree with the majority that § 2 was not violated when the state enacted Plan 1374C. I therefore dissent from that portion of the court's opinion.

V.

As I stated at the outset, I reluctantly concur with the court's judgment insofar as it addresses the claims related to the dismantling of District 24. It is not so much my agreement with the majority's assessment of the facts that causes me to do so, but rather it is instead the lack of clear guidance from the Supreme Court or the circuits regarding the extent to which *Ashcroft's* recognition of the value of coalitional and influence districts carries over into the § 2 context. At the present time, controlling law compels the conclusion reached by the majority.

The question whether § 2 creates influence dilution liability is a close one – made so by language in *Ashcroft* recognizing the importance and the value of such districts. My philosophical trouble with the controlling law's sacrosanct view of the 50% rule flows from the fact that the Voting Rights Act endeavors to put minority voters on an equal footing in all aspects of the political process. *See*

generally Stanley Pierre-Louis, *The Politics of Influence; Recognizing Influence Dilution Claims Under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act,* 62 U. Chi. L.Rev. 1215, 1224 (1995) ("Indeed, Section 2 refers to open participation for minority voters in the 'political processes leading to nomination or election' as well as the opportunity 'to elect representatives of choice.' ") Just as minority voters are not immune from the obligation to "pull, haul, and trade to find common political ground," neither should a redistricting plan have the effect of operating unequally on a minority group's ability to engage in these very activities.

Participation in the political process is hard work. It is harder for minority groups who have suffered the legacy of a history of official discrimination. We heard compelling testimony from Deralyn Davis, the Chairman Emeritus of the Texas Coalition of Black Democrats, about just how hard it is for minority voters in the state of Texas. She described the grassroots efforts of her and others to build coalitions, mobilize, and increase the African American influence in the state's political machine. The efforts did not focus on one location in the state, but extended statewide. The testimony of others was consistent.

Under Plan 1000C, in use until the 2000 census, the black citizen voting age population of District 24 was 20.1%. Under Plan 1151C, the court drawn plan, District 24 has a black voting age population of 21.4%. The electorate in the Democratic primary over the last four election cycles has been roughly 64% African American. Both Dr. Lichtman and the State's expert, Dr. Gaddie, agreed that current District 24 performs for African Americans because those voters control the primary election. The key to the performance of District 24 is the makeup of the balance of the district. It is a political reality that blacks

and Latinos in Texas vote largely Democratic in the general elections. They do so because, at least in Texas, the Democratic candidates are generally more responsive to the concerns of these minority communities. Under Texas's election scheme, in a Democratic leaning district, the key to a minority group's ability to elect a candidate of its choice on an ongoing basis is found in the group's practical ability to "pull, haul, and trade to find common political ground" in the Democratic primary. The ability to nominate in such districts is tantamount to the ability to elect.

The Supreme Court recently reminded us that "the power to influence the political process is not limited to winning elections." *Ashcroft*, 123 S.Ct. at 2512. *Ashcroft* noted that "various studies have suggested that the most effective way to maximize minority voting strength may be to create more influence or coalition districts." *Id.* at 2512-13 (citing David Lublin, *Racial Redistricting and African-American Representation; A Critique of "Do Majority-Minority Districts Maximize Substantive Black Representation in Congress?,"* 93 Am. Pol. Sci. Rev. 183, 185 (1999); Charles Cameron, David Epstein & Sharyn O'Halloran, *Do Majority-Minority Districts Maximize Substantive Black Representation in Congress?,* 90 Am. Pol. Sci. Rev. 794, 808 (1996); C. Swain, *Black Faces, Black Interests* 193-234 (1995); and Bernard Grofman, Lisa Handley, & David Lublin, *Drawing Effective Minority Districts: A Conceptual Framework and Some Empirical Evidence,* 79 N.C.L. Rev. 1383 (2001)). If the most effective way to *maximize* minority voting strength is to create more influence or coalition districts, then the most effective way t *minimize* minority voting strength may be to dismantle those districts in

which a minority group has proven successful in its efforts to "pull, haul, and trade to find common political ground."[6]

Ashcroft leaves the state with flexibility to choose the method of creating fewer black majority-minority districts in favor of a greater number of influence or coalition districts. Alternatively, a state enjoys the flexibility to strengthen its existing majority-minority districts to ensure those districts will continue to elect candidates of choice of the minority community. In the Dallas/Fort Worth area, Texas chose neither route. Texas identified District 24, in which the minority community played a decisive role in the nomination and election processes and, because that group was not a literal majority and elected an Anglo Democrat, rearranged a cohesive community of those voters not into new District 12 (where they might have an impact on the general election), but into new District 26. This arrangement has the practical effect of eliminating the minority voters' political influence. But it has a much larger effect: by treating the minority group in this manner, the state action, I fear, will have the effect of destroying the minority group's hope. It is not accidental that, unlike the plan in *Ashcroft*, the present plan had overwhelming opposition from the minority legislators. The law's insistence on a 50% majority shields this move, but at the same time it ignores the political and social

---

[6] Recent decisions interpreting *Ashcroft* have held that influence dilution claims are cognizable. The first, *Metts v. Murphy, supra*, is cited by the majority. The second is *McNeil v. Legislative Apportionment Commission*, 828 A.2d 840, 853 (N.J. 2003) (holding a provision of New Jersey's state constitution preempted under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act and noting "we believe that *Georgia v. Ashcroft* supports our conclusion that [influence dilution] claims are permitted").

reality that there is more to participation in the electoral process than winning elections.

It is no answer that the disparate destruction of such coalitions might be tough to identify and even harder to remedy. Our charge is not to decide just the easy cases: it is to apply and, when necessary, enforce the protections of the Voting Rights Act. The question, difficult as it may be to answer, should be whether the treatment of such minority coalitions disproportionately affects those voters' ability to participate in the political process. The remedy need not require the protection inviolate of an old district, but it might require the creation of a more competitive one.

The treatment of the minority coalitions in old District 24 was inconsistent with the purposes of the Voting Rights Act. The evidence demonstrates that District 24 under Plan 1151C and Plan 1000C functioned as a district that fostered our progression to a society that is no longer fixated on race. Under this record, the black voters in old District 24 repeatedly nominated and helped to elect an Anglo congressman with an impeccable record of responsiveness to the minority community. To this end, I view the fact that Congressman Frost has not had a primary opponent to reflect favorably on his record. I would credit the testimony of Mayor Ron Kirk and Senator Royce West. Their testimony concerning how District 24 functions for the African American community is persuasive. Although the State, for § 5 purposes, created a new black opportunity district in the Houston area, this is of little consolation to the minority voters in old District 24, particularly the African American community in Tarrant County. The political influence of that minority community has been diluted, understanding, as did the court in *Ashcroft*, that

power at the polls and participation in the political process is not always measured by mathematical majorities. Given the current state of the law, however, I join the court's judgment denying relief on the plaintiffs' claim that the State violated § 2 by the dismantling of District 24. For the same reasons, I necessarily join the court's judgment denying relief with respect to the plaintiffs' claims that the changes to Districts 1, 2, 4, 9, 10, 11 and 17 resulted in cognizable influence dilution claims.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION

WALTER SESSION, ET AL.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO.
Vs.	§	2:03-CV-354
RICK PERRY, ET AL.	§	Consolidated

JUDGMENT

(Filed Jan. 15, 2004)

For the reasons expressed in the court's opinion dated January 6, 2004, it is ORDERED ADJUDGED AND DECREED that the plaintiffs take nothing by way of this suit. The court renders judgment in favor of the defendants on all claims asserted against them in these consolidated redistricting cases.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this 15th day of January, 2004.

/s/ Patrick E. Higginbotham
PATRICK E. HIGGINBOTHAM
UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

/s/ Lee H. Rosenthal
LEE H. ROSENTHAL
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

/s/ T. John Ward
T. JOHN WARD
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION

WALTER SESSION, *et al.*,	§	
Plaintiffs,	§	
	§	Civil Action No.
vs	§	2:03-CV-354
RICK PERRY, *et al.*,	§	
Defendants.	§	

NOTICE OF APPEAL

(Filed Jan. 9, 2004)

Notice is hereby given that Plaintiff-Intervenors Travis County and the City of Austin, Texas, hereby appeal the decision of January 6, 2004, by the three-judge court in this case to the Supreme Court of the United States. The appeal is taken pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1253.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Renea Hicks

David A. Escamilla
TRAVIS COUNTY ATTORNEY
P.O. Box 1748
Austin, Texas 78767
(512) 854-9416
fax: (512) 854-4808

David Allan Smith
CITY ATTORNEY OF AUSTIN
P.O. Box 1088
Austin, Texas 78767-1088
(512) 974-2268
fax: (512) 974-2894

Max Renea Hicks
Attorney at Law
State Bar No. 09580400

800 Norwood Tower
114 West 7th Street
Austin, Texas 78701
(512) 480-8231
fax: (512) 476-4557
ATTORNEYS FOR INTERVENORS TRAVIS COUNTY AND CITY OF AUSTIN

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing **NOTICE OF APPEAL** was forwarded by fax or e-mail, as well as by first class U.S. mail, on this 9th day of January, 2004, to each of the following counsel of record at the indicated fax numbers or their email addresses, as well as their postal addresses:

Andy Taylor	(713) 222-1855	Luis Vera	(210) 225-2060
Richard Gladden	(940) 323-1697	Phil Sudan	(713) 652-0503
Gerry Hebert	(703) 567-5876	Morris Overstreet	469-0950
Paul Smith	(202) 639-6066	David Weiser	477-2828
Otis Carroll	(903) 581-1071	Mick Long	472-0639
Franklin Jones, Jr.	(903) 938-3360	Javier Guarjardo	476-5156
Steve Susman	(713) 654-6666	Gary L. Bledsoe	474-7563
Nina Perales	(210) 224-5382	Ted Cruz	474-2697
Anthony Griffin	(409) 763-4102	J.J. Gass	(212) 995-4550
Rolando Rios	(210) 222-2898	James M. Douglas	(713) 313-1049
José Garza	(956) 928-0088		

/s/ Renea Hicks
Max Renea Hicks

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION

WALTER SESSION, ET AL.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO.
vs.	§	2:03-CV-354
RICK PERRY, ET AL.	§	Consolidated

NOTICE OF APPEAL

(Filed Jan. 7, 2004)

NOTICE is hereby given that plaintiffs Eddie Jackson, Barbara Marshall, Gertrude "Traci" Fisher, Hargie Faye Jacob-Savoy, Ealy Boyd, J.B. Mayfield, Roy Stanley, Phyllis Cottle, Molly Woods, Brian Manley, Tommy Adkisson, Samuel T. Biscoe, David James Butts, Ronald Knowlton Davis, Dorothy Dean, Wilhelmina R. Delco, Gustavo Luis "Gus" Garcia, Samuel Garcia, Lester Gibson, Eunice June Mitchell Givens, Margaret J. Gomez, Mack Ray Hernandez, Art Murillo, Richard Raymond, Ernesto Silva, Louis Simms, Clint Smith, Connie Sonnen, Alfred Thomas Stanley, Maria Lucina Ramirez Torres, Elisa Vasquez, Fernando Villareal, Willia Wooten, Ana Yañez-Correa, Mike Zuniga, Jr., and Plaintiff-Intervenors Gene Green, Chris Bell, Nick Lampson, Lester Bellow, Homer Guillory, John Bland, and Reverend Wille Davis hereby APPEAL the January 6, 2004, decision of the three-judge court in this case to the Supreme Court of the United States. This appeal is taken pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1253.

/s/ Respectfully submitted,

O W Carroll

Otis W. Carroll – *Attorney-in-Charge for the Jackson Plaintiffs*

Bar No. 038 957 00
IRELAND, CARROLL & KELLEY, P.C.
6101 South Broadway, Suite 500
Tyler, Texas 75703
Telephone: (903) 561-1600
Fax: (903) 581-1071

Franklin Jones, Jr.
Bar No. 000 000 55
JONES & JONES
201 West Houston Street
Marshall, Texas 75761
Telephone: (903) 938-4395
Fax: (903) 938-3360

Paul M. Smith
Sam Hirsch
JENNER & BLOCK LLP
601 Thirteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 639-6000
Fax: (202) 639-6066

J. Gerald Hebert – *Attorney-in-Charge for the Democratic Congressional Intervenors*
J. GERALD HEBERT P.C
ATTORNEY AT LAW
5019 Waple Lane
Alexandria, VA 22304
Telephone:(703) 567-5873
Fax: (703) 567-5876

Stephen D. Susman
Texas Bar No. 19521000
H. Lee Godfrey
Texas Bar No. 08054000
Jonathan J. Ross
Texas Bar No. 00791575
SUSMAN GODFREY LLP
Suite 5100
1000 Louisiana
Houston, TX 77002-5096
Telephone: (713) 651-9366
Fax: (713) 654-6666

David Weiser
Bar No. 211 074 70
Jeremy Wright
Bar No. 240 377 46
KATOR, PARKS & WEISER, P.L.L.C.
812 San Antonio Street, Suite 100
Austin, Texas 78701
Telephone: (512) 322-0600
Fax: (512) 477-2828

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 7th day of January 2004, I served a copy of the foregoing Notice of Appeal on all counsel of record by email and Unites States mail, first-class, postage prepaid.

/s/ O W Carroll

OTIS W. CARROLL

(2)

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JUL 2 8 2004
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 03-1400

In the Supreme Court of the United States

TRAVIS COUNTY, *ET AL.*,
Appellants,
v.
RICK PERRY, GOVERNOR OF TEXAS, *ET AL.*,
Appellees.

On Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas

MOTION TO AFFIRM

GREG ABBOTT
Attorney General of Texas
BARRY R. MCBEE
First Assistant Attorney General
EDWARD D. BURBACH
Deputy Attorney General for Litigation
DON R. WILLETT
Deputy Attorney General for Legal Counsel

R. TED CRUZ
Solicitor General
Counsel of Record
MATTHEW F. STOWE
Deputy Solicitor General
DON CRUSE
Assistant Solicitor General
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
P.O. Box 12548 (MC 059)
Austin, Texas 78711-2548
(512) 936-1700

COUNSEL FOR APPELLEES

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether a State may use the most recent block-level decennial census data for congressional redistricting, at least until plaintiffs prove a more accurate set of data that is sufficiently geographically precise for congressional redistricting.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Question Presented i

Table of Contents ii

Table of Authorities iv

Statement of the Case 1

Argument 6

The Questions Presented Are Insubstantial 7

I. There Is No Prohibition on "Mid-Decade" Redistricting 8

A. The Constitution Gives State Legislatures the Primary Responsibility for Redistricting 8

B. Congress Has Not Exercised Any Power to Regulate the Frequency with Which State Legislatures May Redistrict 9

C. Federal Courts Have Repeatedly Recognized the Limited Nature of Court-Drawn Plans and the Primacy of State Legislative Plans in the Constitutional Scheme 10

II. Appellants Failed to Discharge Their Burden of Proving That the New Districts are not Equipopulous 13

III. There Is No Legal Foundation for Appellants' Burden-Shifting Argument 15

IV. Appellants Lack Standing to Bring These Claims 18

Conclusion 18

Appendix A:
Declaration of Ryan Robinson
(Austin/Travis County Trial Exhibit 1) 1a

Appendix B:
Supplemental Declaration of Ryan Robinson and
Census Count Question Resolution (CQR) Data
for Texas (Austin/Travis County Trial Exhibit 2) 4a

Appendix C:
Federal Register Notice (excerpts): Census 2000
Count Question Resolution (CQR) Program 7a

Appendix D:
Balderas v. Texas, No. 6:01-CV-158, slip op.
(E.D.Tex. Nov. 14, 2001) (per curiam),
aff'd mem., 536 U.S. 919 (2002) 14a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases **Page**

Abrams v. Johnson, 521 U.S.74 (1997) 11

Branch v. Smith, 538 U.S. 254 (2003) 8

Bush v. Martin,
251 F.Supp. 484 (S.D. Tex. 1966) 12

Bush v. Vera,
517 U.S. 952 (1996) 2

Colleton County Council v. McConnell,
201 F.Supp.2d 618 (D.S.C. 2002) 10

Connor v. Finch, 431 U.S. 407 (1977) 10, 11, 17

Dep't of Commerce v. U.S. House of Representatives,
525 U.S. 316 (1999) 14

Gaffney v. Cummings,
412 U.S. 735 (1973) 14

Growe v. Emison, 507 U.S. 25 (1993) 8, 17

Johnson v. Miller,
922 F.Supp. 1556 (S.D. Ga. 1995) 11

Karcher v. Daggett,
462 U.S. 725 (1983) 13, 14, 16, 17

Larios v. Cox, 300 F.Supp.2d 1320 (N.D. Ga.),
aff'd mem., 124 S.Ct. 2806 (2004) 16, 18

Miller v. Johnson, 515 U.S. 900 (1995) 10

Perry v. Del Rio,
67 S.W.3d 85 (Tex. 2001) 8

Smiley v. Holm, 285 U.S. 355 (1932) 8, 9

State ex rel. Davis v. Hildebrandt,
241 U.S. 565 (1916) 8

United States v. Hays, 515 U.S. 737(1995) 18

Upham v. Seamon,
456 U.S. 37 (1982) (per curiam) 10, 12, 17

Valdespino v. Alamo Heights ISD,
168 F.3d 848 (5th Cir. 1999) 14

Vera v. Bush,
861 F.Supp. 1304 (S.D. Tex. 1994) 2

Vera v. Bush,
933 F.Supp. 1341 (S.D. Tex. 1996) 2, 12

Vera v. Bush,
980 F.Supp. 251 (S.D. Tex. 1997) 2, 13

Wesberry v. Sanders, 376 U.S. 1 (1964) 17, 18

White v. Weiser, 412 U.S. 783 (1973) 8, 12

Wise v. Lipscomb, 437 U.S. 535 (1978) 11, 17

Constitutional Provisions, Statutes, and Rules

U.S. CONST. art. I, §2 18

U.S. CONST. art. I, §4, cl. 1 ..... 8, 9

2 U.S.C. §2c 6, 9

2 U.S.C. §7 9

2 U.S.C. §9 9

SUP. CT. R. 18.6 1

SUP. CT. R. 18.12 18

TEX. CONST. art. III, §1 8

Other Authorities

MICHAEL BARONE, THE ALMANAC OF AMERICAN POLITICS 2004 2

THE FEDERALIST No. 59 (A. Hamilton) 9

http://www.sos.state.tx.us/elections/historical/ 2

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

TRAVIS COUNTY, *ET AL.*,
Appellants,

v.

RICK PERRY, GOVERNOR OF TEXAS, *ET AL.*,
Appellees.

On Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas

---

MOTION TO AFFIRM

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 18.6, Appellees the State of Texas, Texas Governor Rick Perry, Texas Lieutenant Governor David Dewhurst, Texas House Speaker Tom Craddick, and Texas Secretary of State Geoffrey S. Connor (collectively, "the State") move to summarily affirm the judgment of the three-judge court on the ground that the arguments presented are so insubstantial as not to warrant further argument. SUP. CT. R. 18.6.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Following the 1990 decennial census, in 1991 the Texas Legislature adopted a congressional redistricting plan for the State of Texas. Since Reconstruction, Texas voters had been reliably Democratic, but, in the 1980s and 90s, they began voting more and more Republican. The 1991 plan, whose design has been credited in large part to Appellant Congressman Martin Frost, has been described by neutral observers as the "shrewdest" Democratic

gerrymander of the 1990s. J.S. App., at 54a-55a (citing MICHAEL BARONE, THE ALMANAC OF AMERICAN POLITICS 2004, at 1448).[1]

Over the next twelve years, that plan was judicially modified twice,[2] including in 2001 when two new congressional seats were added after the 2000 census. App. D, at 14a. But, throughout those modifications, the basic contours of the plan remained the same,[3] preserving the districts of incumbent Democratic Members of Congress despite the growing Republican leanings of the Texas electorate.[4]

---

1. Appellants' jurisdictional statement will be cited as "J.S.," and their appendix items will be cited as "J.S. App." The State's appendices are cited as "App."

2. In 1996, three of Texas's then-thirty congressional districts were redrawn as part of the *Bush v. Vera* litigation. *See* 933 F.Supp. 1341 (S.D. Tex. 1996), *remanded from Bush v. Vera*, 517 U.S. 952 (1996), *aff'g, Vera v. Bush*, 861 F.Supp. 1304 (S.D. Tex. 1994) (finding these three districts unconstitutional but staying the effect of its decision pending appeal); *see also Vera v. Bush*, 980 F.Supp. 251 (S.D. Tex. 1997) (leaving the court-drawn districts in place). The second judicial modification was in 2001. App. D, at 14a.

3. In 2001, the federal court plan added two seats while causing the least disruption to the existing plan, App. D, at 19a; *see also id.*, at 20a ("It was plain that . . . no incumbent was paired with another incumbent or significantly harmed by the plan."). As a result, all 28 incumbents who ran for reelection won back their seats.

4. By 2002, Texas voters had elected Republicans to 27 out of 27 statewide elected offices and to majorities in both Houses of the State Legislature. *See* http://www.sos.state.tx.us/elections/historical/; *see also* J.S. App., at 4a. The Republican candidate for governor in 2002 prevailed with 58 percent of the vote, *id.*, and the Republican candidate for governor in 1998 garnered 69 percent of the statewide vote, *id.* Nevertheless, despite these statewide voting trends, in 2002 Democrats still maintained a majority in congressional delegation, which was split 17 to 15. *Id.*

In 2003, for the first time in over a decade, the Texas Legislature passed a congressional redistricting plan, Plan 1374C. That plan undid the preexisting Democratic gerrymander, jeopardized the reelection chances of several incumbent Democratic Congressmen, and created an additional African-American and additional Hispanic opportunity district in Texas. This litigation immediately ensued.

Following extensive discovery, two weeks of trial, and dozens of witnesses, the three-judge federal court affirmed the legality of the plan in all respects. The court carefully weighed the evidence, assessed the credibility of the witnesses, sifted through the facts concerning each contested congressional district, and issued a detailed and thorough 99-page legal opinion affirming the legality of Plan 1374C.

Appellants' Statement of the Case focuses on the reliability of the census data that were used to draw Plan 1374C. There is no factual dispute that Plan 1374C's thirty-two congressional districts are perfectly equipopulous based on the Census Bureau's official block-level data, with a maximum variance of one person per district (because the total number of Texans is not evenly divisible by thirty two).

Appellants place great emphasis on the Count Question Resolution (CQR) Program results that were released in the weeks prior to the enactment of Plan 1374C on October 12, 2003.[5] J.S., at 6 n.7; *see also* App. B, at 6a. However, the CQR data merely

---

5. Appellants omitted the specific documents upon which they relied from their Jurisdictional Statement. Because Appellants must satisfy a high burden of proof in order to prevail on an equal-population claim, *see* Part II, *infra*, the State has attached both of Appellants' trial exhibits, *in toto*, for the Court's convenience. *See* App. A (Declaration of Ryan Robinson) & App. B (Supplemental Declaration & CQR release).

reflected slight population corrections for selected local governmental units that had requested that particular housing clusters be reassigned or borders be corrected. App. B, at 6a (CQR release for Texas); App. C, at 7a, 9a-11a (describing the program).

The Census Bureau expressly qualified the release of CQR data with an official statement that "[t]he CQR program is not a mechanism or process to challenge the March 6, 2001, decision of the Secretary of Commerce to release unadjusted numbers from Census 2000 for redistricting purposes . . . ." App. C, at 7a (Federal Register); *accord* App. C, at 12a ("The Census Bureau will not change the . . . redistricting counts to reflect corrections resulting from the CQR process.").

Consequently, any implication from Appellants' Statement of the Case that the CQR data could form the basis of a perfectly equipopulous statewide congressional redistricting plan is mistaken. The Texas CQR data do not cover the entire State, and even for the covered regions, it contains data only at the geographic level of cities and counties. *See* App. B. Appellants did not submit any evidence proving a method to translate data at that level of granularity into perfectly equipopulous congressional districts, nor did they propose a congressional map based on such data.

Moreover, the CQR data do not indicate any change in the population for any of the component cities or counties within Congressional District 10, the district in which the only individual Appellant, Gus Garcia, resides.

Appellants' characterization of the record as to post-census population changes fails to reveal the dearth of evidence they presented concerning the current post-census population. *See* J.S., at 6-7. Appellants introduced a brief declaration from a city demographer to the unremarkable effect that the population of Texas has not been perfectly static since the official census date of April 1, 2000. App. A (Robinson declaration). Appellants'

declaration discusses population changes in terms of statewide growth, general spatial distribution of the population, and broad trends.[6] *See* App. A, at 1a-3a.

Finally, contrary to Appellants' characterization, the record does not demonstrate that legislators took into account any post-census population changes that had already occurred. *Cf.* J.S., at 7 ("those charged with redrawing the lines" "did not" "ignore[] these population changes"). The testimony referenced by Appellants concerned *future* growth trends, not any attempt to benefit from past changes.[7] J.S., at 7-8. And the testimony cited by Appellants does not bear on Congressional District 10, the district in which the one individual Appellant resides.

---

6. Appellants suggest the statewide population had by late 2003 increased by "more than a million persons—enough for still two more congressional seats." J.S., at 6. Because congressional reapportionment of seats awarded Texas only thirty-two seats, J.S. App., at 3a, drawing more than thirty-two districts was not an option.

7. Appellants relied on two snippets of trial testimony to support their claim. The first, about District 4, by its terms discussed future growth patterns. *See* J.S., at 7 (citing trial testimony that a district would "grow into" a different political column). The second, concerning Wise County, discussed whether that county shared common drivers of growth with other counties in the district—*i.e.*, whether those counties shared an economic community of interest—not the county's relative population growth. *See* J.S., at 8 (citing trial transcript). None of this testimony shows legislators looking to a different set of *current* population numbers to generate unequal districts.

ARGUMENT

The judgment below has yielded five separate appeals to this Court.[8] Four of the five jurisdictional statements challenge what they term "mid-decade" redistricting. Although the Texas Legislature had not passed a congressional redistricting plan for twelve years, the appellants repeatedly frame their challenge as one to state legislatures' revisiting redistricting multiple times in a single decade.

In the face of explicit constitutional language and Supreme Court precedent making clear that it is the prerogative and primary responsibility of state legislatures to redistrict, the appellants ask the courts to engraft an additional limitation onto the Constitution.

Each set of appellants has a different theory as to why they believe "mid-decade" redistricting should be judicially prohibited: the *Jackson* Appellants urge a fusion with the Court's political gerrymandering cases; Appellant Henderson relies on federal statute, 2 U.S.C. §2c; Appellants Congresswomen Lee and Johnson rely on the Census Clause of the U.S. Constitution; and the Travis County Appellants in the instant case suggest modifying the "one person-one vote" standards to require updating the census count more often than once a decade.

Although creative, none of these theories is persuasive. Each will be addressed in the relevant Motion to Affirm.[9]

---

8. In addition to this appeal, see also *Jackson v. Perry*, (No. 03-1391); *American GI Forum v. Perry*, (No. 03-1396); *Jackson Lee v. Perry*, (No. 03-1399); *Henderson v. Perry*, (No. 03-9644).

9. Because of these similarities, Part I of this Motion to Affirm necessarily covers the same ground as the respective Part I in the Motions to Affirm filed in those other appeals.

THE QUESTIONS PRESENTED ARE INSUBSTANTIAL

On the issue of "mid-decade" redistricting, these appeals present no split of authority whatsoever. Nor do they implicate the broad policy specter repeatedly invoked—that of state legislatures returning seriatim, year after year, to redistrict throughout the decade. The facts of this case do not present the Court with an opportunity to address that question. Rather, this case concerns a factbound application of settled law to the unremarkable circumstances of a legislature adopting a redistricting plan following a judicial remedial plan that expressly invited the Legislature to do so. Given that the Texas Legislature had not adopted a congressional redistricting plan for twelve years prior, the issue of "mid-decade" redistricting simply is not presented.

The three-judge court unanimously rejected all of the challenges to so-called "mid-decade" redistricting. The majority opinion painstakingly refuted the appellants individual arguments, J.S. App., at 5a-26a, and Judge Ward's limited dissent explicitly "join[ed] the court's decision that the Elections Clause does not prohibit mid-decade redistricting." J.S. App., at 124a.

With respect to the specific legal theory raised by Appellants, no court has ever adopted it. Although framed in terms of this Court's "one person-one vote" doctrine, the argument is in reality a back-door attempt to convince the Court to prohibit "mid-decade" redistricting. That argument is contrary to the text of the Constitution and to the Court's clear precedents. There is no cause for the Court to resolve an appeal offering so insubstantial a legal basis.

I. THERE IS NO PROHIBITION ON "MID-DECADE" REDISTRICTING.

A. The Constitution Gives State Legislatures the Primary Responsibility for Redistricting.

Article I, §4 of the United States Constitution, known as the Elections Clause, expressly delegates power over congressional districting to the state legislatures:

> "The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, *shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof*; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of chusing Senators." U.S. CONST. art. I, §4, cl. 1 (emphasis added).

This Court has long held that the power delegated to States includes the power to draw congressional districts. *See Smiley v. Holm*, 285 U.S. 355, 366-67 (1932) (evaluating redistricting power through Article I, §4); *State ex rel. Davis v. Hildebrandt*, 241 U.S. 565, 569 (1916) (same). And, the Court has repeatedly held that, "the Constitution leaves with the States *primary responsibility* for apportionment of their federal congressional . . . districts." *Growe v. Emison*, 507 U.S. 25, 34 (1993) (emphasis added); *see also White v. Weiser*, 412 U.S. 783, 795 (1973) ("[S]tate legislatures have 'primary jurisdiction' over legislative reapportionment."); *Branch v. Smith*, 538 U.S. 254, 261 (2003) ("[Redistricting] is primarily the duty and responsibility of the State through its legislature.").

Moreover, under Texas law, "[t]he Legislature is the department constitutionally responsible for apportioning the State into federal congressional legislative districts." *Perry v. Del Rio*, 67 S.W.3d 85, 91 (Tex. 2001); *see also* TEX. CONST. art. III, §1 ("The Legislative power of this State shall be vested in a Senate and House of

Representatives, which together shall be styled 'The Legislature of the State of Texas.'").

B. Congress Has Not Exercised Any Power to Regulate the Frequency with Which State Legislatures May Redistrict.

The words "Times, Places, and Manner" in the federal Elections Clause are "comprehensive words embrac[ing] authority to provide a complete code for congressional elections," subject to Congress's power also to enact laws over the same subject matter. *Smiley*, 285 U.S., at 366-67. As Alexander Hamilton explained, because it was not feasible to insert an entire election code into the Constitution, "a discretionary power over elections ought to exist somewhere." THE FEDERALIST No. 59 (A. Hamilton). The method "with reason . . . preferred by the convention" was to give power "primarily" in the state legislatures but with "ultimat[e]" oversight by Congress. *Id.*

Congress has on occasion used its power under Article I, §4 to enact "such regulations." *See* U.S. CONST. art. I, §4, cl. 1. For example, Congress has provided a uniform day for congressional elections. *See* 2 U.S.C. §7. Congress has provided that votes for congressional candidates must be by written or printed ballots. *See* 2 U.S.C. §9. And, in regard to congressional districting, Congress has provided that Members of the House must be elected from single-member districts rather than the previously accepted practices of at-large statewide seats or multi-member districts. *See* 2 U.S.C. §2c ("[T]here shall be established by law a number of districts equal to the number of Representatives.").

Thus, there is no dispute that, pursuant to the second part of the Elections Clause ("Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations"), Congress could have chosen to prohibit mid-decade redistricting. But, critically, Congress has not done so. No federal statute speaks at all to *when or how often* a State can redraw

its congressional districts. And, absent congressional prohibition, state legislatures retain broad authority over the decision to redistrict.

C. Federal Courts Have Repeatedly Recognized the Limited Nature of Court-Drawn Plans and the Primacy of State Legislative Plans in the Constitutional Scheme.

Given this broad grant of constitutional authority, when federal courts are forced to step into redistricting they do so in a limited way that recognizes the "primary jurisdiction" of the state legislatures in this field. *See Upham v. Seamon*, 456 U.S. 37, 41-42 (1982) (per curiam). Federal courts treat it as an "unwelcome obligation [to] perform[]in the legislature's stead," because, in the words of the Court, "a state legislature is the institution that is by far the best situated" to undertake redistricting. *Connor v. Finch*, 431 U.S. 407, 414-15 (1977). A federal court, meanwhile, "lack[s] the political authoritativeness that the legislature can bring to the task." *Id.* at 415. "Federal courts, unlike state legislatures, are not in a position to reconcile competing state policies on the electorate's behalf, nor to engage in political policy-making decisions. . . . [Courts] do not possess the latitude afforded a state legislature to advance political agendas." *Colleton County Council v. McConnell*, 201 F.Supp.2d 618, 628 (D.S.C. 2002); *see also Miller v. Johnson*, 515 U.S. 900, 915 (1995) ("Electoral districting is a most difficult subject for legislatures, and so the States must have discretion to exercise the political judgment necessary to balance competing interests.").

Accordingly, federal court-ordered redistricting plans are focused on remedying violations of the Constitution or of the Voting Rights Act. As the three-judge court noted in adopting the 2001 Texas congressional map: "The Congress has by its enactment of voting rights laws constrained the political process and given the courts a role—to the extent of those constraints. We have no

warrant to impose our vision of 'proper' restraints upon the political process beyond the constraints imposed by the Constitution or the Voting Rights Act." App. D, at 25a; *see also* App. D, at 14a-15a, 21a-22a, 24a-25a (noting limited nature of the federal court role); *accord Upham*, 456 U.S., at 43 (holding that unless the plan violated the Constitution or the Voting Rights Act, "the District Court was not free . . . to disregard the political program of the Texas State Legislature").

As the Court has noted concerning the Voting Rights Act,

> "Legislative bodies should not leave their reapportionment tasks to the federal courts; but when those with legislative responsibilities do not respond, or the imminence of a state election makes it impractical for them to do so, it becomes the 'unwelcome obligation' of the federal court to devise and impose a reapportionment plan *pending later legislative action*." *Wise v. Lipscomb*, 437 U.S. 535, 540 (1978) (emphasis added) (quoting *Connor v. Finch*, 431 U.S. 407, 415 (1977)).

These basic principles—that state legislatures have "primary jurisdiction" over redistricting, are the institution appropriate for the political nature of the task, and can best weigh competing state policies that go beyond minimum compliance with the law—lead to an inexorable result: the mere fact of a court-ordered plan does not foreclose a subsequent, legislative congressional redistricting plan, even within the same decade. *See Johnson v. Miller*, 922 F.Supp. 1556, 1569 (S.D. Ga. 1995) ("We do no harm with this plan, which cures the unconstitutionality of the former and can serve in 'caretaker' status until the legislature convenes to change it. *That may occur following the millennium census, or before.*") (emphasis added), *aff'd sub nom Abrams v. Johnson*, 521 U.S.74 (1997).

The presence of a prior court-ordered remedial plan does nothing to alter the Legislature's authority to adopt a subsequent redistricting plan. Indeed, one need look no further than Texas's own history of congressional redistricting to find repeated examples of courts' deferring to the primary responsibility of the State Legislature to draw its own congressional districts, even immediately after a court-ordered remedial plan. *See* J.S. App., at 9a n.14 (collecting cases).[10]

---

10. For example, in *Bush v. Martin*, 251 F.Supp. 484, 561 (S.D. Tex. 1966), the district court upheld a redistricting plan as minimally constitutional and expressly refuted the argument that the Legislature could not later alter it, even before the next decennial census: "That we do not find [the plan] deficient enough to set it aside and install one of our own is a long way from holding that it is free from shortcomings or that such shortcomings may somehow get frozen into the legislative thinking (or our own) as adequate criteria for the future." In *White v. Weiser*, 412 U.S. 783 (1973), the district court had indicated that its remedial plan was without prejudice to consideration and adoption of any new plan by the Legislature before the next census. *Id.*, at 789. And even that limited order was too broad, and stayed by this Court, because it had unnecessarily deviated from the policy choices made by the Texas Legislature. *Id.*, at 795-97. Likewise, in *Upham*, the Court reversed a district court remedial plan as not "closely approximat[ing] the state-proposed plan." 456 U.S., at 42. In determining whether to allow the now-disapproved district-court plan to be used in the imminent elections, the Court expressly noted that it was "only an interim plan *and is subject to replacement by the legislature in 1983.*" *Id.*, at 44 (emphasis added).

In *Vera v. Bush*, 933 F.Supp. 1341 (S.D. Tex. 1996), the court found the legislative plan to be unconstitutional and ordered its own plan as an interim replacement. *Id.*, at 1346, 1353. In response to an argument that the court should allow the 1996 elections to proceed under the old map, the court replied that the Legislature would be free to implement its own map when it met again: "[Texas Lieutenant Governor] Bullock and [House Speaker] Laney contend that the Texas Legislature is ready and willing to redistrict during its 1997 regular session. Of course, in any

Consistent with this long line of cases, nothing in the three-judge court's 2001 *Balderas* decision purported to divest the Texas Legislature of authority to redistrict in the future. Indeed, the Legislature acted promptly, accepting the court's express invitation to undertake this "quintessentially legislative" task and create two new minority-opportunity districts in Texas through Plan 1374C. *See* App. D, at 21a. There is no support for Appellants' argument that the use of a court-ordered plan in the 2002 election cycle somehow precluded Plan 1374C.

II. APPELLANTS FAILED TO DISCHARGE THEIR BURDEN OF PROVING THAT THE NEW DISTRICTS ARE NOT EQUIPOPULOUS.

The Court has held that, where congressional redistricting plans are challenged on an equal-population basis, plaintiffs "must bear the burden of proof on this issue, and if they fail to show that the differences could have been avoided the apportionment scheme must be upheld." *Karcher v. Daggett*, 462 U.S. 725, 730-31 (1983). Appellants do not dispute that the State's redistricting map is perfectly equipopulous under the Census Bureau's block-level data released in March 2001.

Appellants instead argue that the State should have used a different set of population data. But Appellants do not offer evidence that any other source of accurate data exists that could be used to draw districts with a smaller population deviation than the State's perfectly equipopulous districts. Nor do Appellants even

---

event, they will have that opportunity . . . ." *Id.*, at 1346; *see also id.* at 1353. And in *Vera v. Bush*, 980 F.Supp. 251 (S.D. Tex. 1997), after the Texas Legislature failed to enact its own plan in 1997, the district court left its own interim plan in place for the 1998 election cycle. *Id.*, at 254. The court, however, explicitly recognized that the Legislature was free to enact its own congressional redistricting plan as a replacement when it next met. *Id.*, at 252-53.

attempt to propose such a map based on either of the two conflicting data sources they propose, the limited-purpose Count Question Resolution (CQR) Program data or various postcensal population estimates.

These evidentiary failures are fatal to any equal-population claim because of the strong and well-founded presumption in favor of using the census enumeration data for redistricting. Even recognizing that decennial census data "measure[] population at only a single instant in time [and] [d]istrict populations are constantly changing, often at different rates in either direction, up or down," *Gaffney v. Cummings*, 412 U.S. 735, 746 (1973), the Court has held that States may rely on the decennial data until replacement data are proven up. This is because "the census data provide the only reliable—albeit less than perfect—indication of the districts 'real' relative population levels . . . [, and] because the census count represents the 'best population data available,' it is the only basis for good-faith attempts to achieve population equality." *Karcher*, 462 U.S., at 738; *see also Dep't of Commerce v. U.S. House of Representatives*, 525 U.S. 316, 344 (1999).

Thus, when plaintiffs seek to dislodge the presumptively accurate census data, they must meet a heavy burden. As the Fifth Circuit has held, plaintiffs must demonstrate that their proposed method of calculating populations is "thoroughly documented, ha[s] a high degree of accuracy, and [is] clear, cogent, and convincing." *Valdespino v. Alamo Heights ISD*, 168 F.3d 848, 853-54 (5th Cir. 1999). Appellants presented no such evidence.

Appellants offered the three-judge court below no alternative map or methodology, instead simply asserting that the prior court-drawn Plan 1151C must be used. Appellants' urged remedy—maintaining Plan 1151C—is a telling demonstration of their real objective, not to champion "one person-one vote," but to

prevent *any* redistricting that altered the incumbency protection of Plan 1151C.

Because *both Plan 1151C and 1374C used the identical 2000 census data*, Appellants' defense of the former over the latter cannot be understood as a good-faith critique of the data.

There is thus no evidence that, if Plan 1151C were used in 2004, it would be any more equipopulous than is Plan 1374C. Consequently, there is no basis to reverse the judgment of the three-judge court rejecting Appellants' claims. *See* J.S. App., at 157a.[11]

III. There Is No Legal Foundation for Appellants' Burden-Shifting Argument.

Because Appellants presented inadequate evidence to support their claims, *see* Part II, *supra*, they now argue that this Court should relieve them of their burden of proof, J.S., at 15. This directly contradicts the holding in *Karcher*, which placed the burden firmly on the party challenging the equipopulosity of a plan.

---

11. Nor is there any reason to believe that Plan 1151C could have met the standard urged by Appellants, even immediately after it was drawn. Elections were not held under Plan 1151C until November 2002. Yet, Appellants presented evidence that by July 1, 2002—months before—the population of Texas had already changed dramatically. *See* App. A, at 1a.

Karcher, 462 U.S., at 730-31.[12] And Appellants cite no legal authority to the contrary.

Appellants argument would also require the Court to disregard established precedent. For example, in *Georgia v. Ashcroft*, the Supreme Court *expressly approved* the legality of using decennial census data throughout the decade:

> "When the decennial census numbers are released, States must redistrict to account for any changes or shifts in

12. This case does not resemble the situation presented in *Larios*, which dealt with population disparities in *state* legislative districts in Georgia. *Larios v. Cox*, 300 F.Supp.2d 1320, 1327 (N.D. Ga.), *aff'd mem.*, 124 S.Ct. 2806 (2004). Not being governed by *Karcher*'s requirement of absolute equipopulosity for congressional districts, those state-level districts had population variances of up to 10 percent. And, as the *Larios* district court found, those variances—apparent on the face of the census data being used—were deliberate and "systematic[]," underpopulating the favored party and overpopulating the disfavored party. *Id.* at 1329.

No such evidence is present in this case. The State's plan complies perfectly with the requirement of population equality. Under the controlling census numbers, the maximum deviation between districts is one person. And Appellants have presented no evidence of any efforts intentionally to distort equipopulosity, to further partisan ends or otherwise.

Indeed, it is Appellants' rule that, if adopted, would "dilute" the standard of "one person-one vote," *cf. Cox v. Larios*, 124 S.Ct., at 2808 (Stevens, J., concurring), by replacing the presumption in favor of objective census enumeration data with the requirement of using subjective and varying estimates of population change.

> population. But *before the new census, States operate under the legal fiction that even 10 years later, the plans are constitutionally apportioned.*" 123 S.Ct. 2498, 2515 n.2 (2003) (emphasis added).[13]

Appellants' rule would also, in practice, disrupt the relative role of state legislatures and federal courts in redistricting. Appellants suggest that burden shifting "would not constitute an absolute legal bar" on a legislature drawing districts after a court-ordered plan has been used. J.S., at 15. That suggestion is disingenuous. *Wesberry v. Sanders* requires almost perfect equality between congressional districts. 376 U.S. 1, 7-8 (1964). In practice, that high degree of mathematical precision would be almost impossible using any data other than the decennial block-level data. Appellants' rule would thus turn on its head the clear guidance that state legislatures have been delegated primary jurisdiction over redistricting as a constitutional matter. *See Growe*, 507 U.S., at 34; *Upham*, 456 U.S., at 41-42; *Connor*, 431 U.S., at 414-15; *see also Wise*, 437 U.S., at 540 ("[I]t becomes the 'unwelcome obligation' . . . of the federal court to devise and impose a reapportionment plan *pending later legislative action*." (emphasis added)).

Appellants presented no data superior to the legally-binding 2000 census data. They presented nothing whatsoever at the block level—the level required to draw districts satisfying equipopulosity. Nor did they present or advert to any methodology for discerning any such block-level data other than using census data. Accordingly, they failed to carry their burden of proof, *see Karcher*, 462 U.S., at 730-31, and the three-judge court properly rejected their claim.

---

13. Indeed, in that 2003 decision, the Court used thirteen-year-old census data from 1990 to evaluate a Voting Rights Act challenge, specifically rejecting the dissent's argument that such data were "irrelevant." *Id.*

IV. Appellants Lack Standing to Bring These Claims.

Appellants also lack standing to bring their equal-population claim. Two of Appellants are governmental entities—The City of Austin and Travis County—neither of which is within the textual protection of Article I. *See* U.S. CONST. art. I, §2 ("by the People of the several States"); *Wesberry*, 376 U.S., at 8.

The third Appellant, Gus Garcia, has shown no cognizable injury. He resides in Congressional District 10, but there is no evidence that his congressional district suffers from any population inequality. The CQR data indicate no corrections for counties within Congressional District 10. *See* App. B, at 6a (CQR data by county and city). And with regard to postcensal estimates, there was no evidence introduced about the *relative* growth or lack of growth in his congressional district as compared with the State as a whole. *Cf.* App. A. (Robinson declaration) (not discussing congressional-district geographies). Appellant Garcia cannot assert an equal-population claim unless he is in an under-represented district. *United States v. Hays*, 515 U.S. 737, 746-47 (1995) (racial gerrymandering); *Larios*, 306 F.Supp.2d, at 1209 (applying *Hays* to the equal-population rule).

CONCLUSION

The Court should summarily affirm the judgment of the three-judge court. SUP. CT. R. 18.12.

Respectfully submitted,

GREG ABBOTT
Attorney General of Texas

BARRY R. MCBEE
First Assistant Attorney General

EDWARD D. BURBACH
Deputy Attorney
General for Litigation

DON R. WILLETT
Deputy Attorney General
for Legal Counsel

R. TED CRUZ
Solicitor General
Counsel of Record

MATTHEW F. STOWE
Deputy Solicitor General

DON CRUSE
Assistant Solicitor Gene[illegible]

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
P.O. Box 12548 (MC 059)
Austin, Texas 78711-2548
(512) 936-1700

July 2004

COUNSEL FOR APPELLEES

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Declaration of Ryan Robinson: Post-Census 2000 Demographic Change in Texas

The redrawn congressional districts of Plan 1374C by HB3 for the state of Texas are based on Census 2000 block-level population data; data that are now old and specious because of rapid and spatially uneven population surges and declines across the state, and additionally, due to changes in the sizes of ethnic groups—for the state as a whole and for communities within the state. It has been almost four years since the federal government conducted its decennial census, and in terms of demographics, a lot has changed in Texas since data sufficient to draw new districts were first made available on March 12, 2001.

Since April 1, 2000—the official Census day that all decennial census data are tethered to—the state of Texas has experienced enough population growth (almost a 1.0 million net gain as of July 1, 2002, according to the Census Bureau) to warrant the addition of two new congressional seats (based on an analysis by Election Data Services, a Washington consulting firm; please see link for Reapportionment Study at the company's web page electiondataservices.com/home.htm). And here is where HB3 begins to foul out, demographically speaking. Now, in late 2003, the state's population growth since Census 2000 has easily exceeded 1.0 million persons because more than 16 months worth of additional growth has occurred since the Bureau's estimate of July 1, 2002. The redistricted HB3 map is abased on old data that reflect a snapshot, a point along the state's growth trajectory that has long since passed.

Population growth comes from two basic sources, migration (the net difference between households moving into the state and households moving out) and natural increase, or the difference between births and deaths. Currently, the state of Texas is experiencing rapid population growth from in-migration and from

natural increase. According to the Census Bureau's 2002 population estimates program (please see Census.Gov.Popest.htm), Texas gets about half of its growth from in-migration and about half from natural increase. As the state continues to gain younger households in their prime child-bearing years and Hispanic families with their higher than average birth rates, Texas is poised to continue to grow enormously, even with attenuated in-migration levels.

Texas is receiving a substantial share of the nation's international immigration stream. Although the magnitude of this migration stream has diminished somewhat after the events of 9/11 and this nation's efforts to more effectively seal its borders, international immigration still contributes a substantial share to the state's overall population growth. This immigration stream is largely non-European, with major components from Asia and Latin America, and shows no sign of stopping anytime soon. Professor Stephan Klineberg at Rice University has outlined the structure of this immigration wave in recent words offered at: report.rice.edu.

The state's Hispanic share of total population is rising rapidly—increasing at an even faster rate during the past four years than it did during the 1990's. And herein lies another point of demographic perversion on the part of HB3—districts have been drawn under Plan 01374C using data that do not fully reflect the current size and spatial scope of the state's largest and most rapidly expanding minority community: Hispanics.

Because US congressional districts must be equal with each other in terms of total population size, the fact that the state has grown markedly and spatially unevenly since April 1, 2000 means that the creators of the HB3 map would have to use current population information to achieve balanced districts. Because old data were used, the resultant districts are not balanced with each other in terms of population.

The enormous population growth that Texas has witnessed over the last three and a half years has not been homogenously spread across

the state. Intra-state migration levels between cities and local household formation rates vary dramatically. Census Bureau estimates data reveal a highly uneven pattern of growth and localized decline. For example, looking at the Census Bureau's mid-year 2002 population estimates shows that the high-flyers of the past decade, places like Dallas and Austin, have seen a slow down in their growth rates, while urban areas like San Antonio (2.0% annualized) and El Paso (1.8% annualized) have taken over as the state's growth leaders (Census.Gov.Popest.htm).

The point here is that population growth is a spatially lumpy phenomenon, and using Census 2000 data to create congressional districts ensures that the districts will not be balanced with one another in terms of total population.

^----------

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing statements are true and correct.

Signed this day, November 14, 2003.

Ryan Folmar Robinson
City Demographer, City of Austin

Appendix B

Supplemental report of Ryan Robinson

Subsequent to Census 2000, the Census Bureau created a program by which local jurisdictions could appeal or challenge their official population and housing counts as produced in the decennial enumeration effort. This appeals process is known as the Count Question Resolution (CAR) program. Information regarding the program may be obtained at the following web page:

http://www.census.gov/dmd/www/CQR.htm

The program began on June 30, 2001 and ended on September 30, 2003. In Texas, a total of 11 jurisdictions sought and received corrected population totals. The revised population total for the state of Texas decreased by 30 persons. The original Census 2000 population figure for the state is 20,851,820. The revised population figure for the state, based on the CQR program is 20,851,790. A listing of the participating jurisdictions is attached—not all population and housing changes are reflected in the table, only changes for participating jurisdictions are shown.

Under the CQR program, local jurisdictions (counties and cities) could appeal their census figures based on three types of possible corrections.

1. Boundary corrections
2. Geocoding corrections, and
3. Coverage corrections

Boundary corrections—Census 2000 respects the proper alignment of the jurisdictional boundaries of functioning governmental units as legally in effect on January 1, 2000. Jurisdictions could use the CQR program to correct boundary errors and gain or lose population accordingly.

Geocoding corrections—concern the placement of living quarters and persons residing therein that were identified during the Census 2000 process but were geographically misplaced. For example, if a jurisdiction can show that an apartment complex falls within a certain census block different from the block that the complex was counted in by the official enumeration, then that change is made at the block-level, while the jurisdiction's total population would not change.

Coverage corrections—deal with housing units and group quarters populations that were either missed entirely or erroneously included by the Census 2000 process. For example, a nursing home and its inhabitants that may have been omitted in the Census 2000 process could be added through the CQR program.

Appendix C

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of the Census

[Docket Number 001215359-0359-01]

RIN Number 0607-XX62

The Census 2000 Count Question Resolution Program

AGENCY: Bureau of the Census.

ACTION: Notice of Program.

SUMMARY: On January 22, 2001, the Bureau of the Census (Census Bureau) published in the **Federal Register** an initial notice relating to the Census 2000 Count Question Resolution (CQR) program (66 FR 6574). This notice provides information concerning the CQR program as well. The CQR program will address corrections for three types of challenges: (1) boundary corrections, (2) geocoding (geographic assignment) corrections, and (3) data processing corrections. (See the heading ``Types of Corrections that will be Considered for the Census 2000 CQR Program" in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section.) The CQR program is not a mechanism or process to challenge the March 6, 2001, decision of the Secretary of Commerce to release unadjusted numbers from Census 2000 for redistricting purposes; nor is it a mechanism or process to challenge or revise the numbers sent to the President on December 28, 2000, to be used to apportion the U.S. House of Representatives.

Corrected Census 2000 Total Population, Group Quarters Population, Total Housing Unit, and Vacant Housing Unit Counts for Governmental Units

Note: Corrected counts are a result of the Count Question Resolution (CQR) Program.

Federal Register/Vol. 66, No. 130/Friday, July 6, 2001 (Summary): *The CQR program is not a mechanism or process to challenge the March 6, 2001, decision of the Secretary of Commerce to release unadjusted numbers from Census 2000 for redistricting purposes; nor is it a mechanism or process to challenge or revise the numbers sent to the President on December 28, 2000, to be used to apportion the U.S. House of Representatives.*

The state level census counts will always be presented, regardless of whether or not there is a CQR change to the counts at the state level.
Below the state level, the tables will present census counts only for those governmental units in which a CQR change has occurred, with one exception. When a CQR chang occurs in a place that is in more than one county, the table will display census counts for all the county parts, regardless of whether or not each part had a CQR change.

Last updated 8/29/2003

Number of governmental units affected by CQR = 11

State County Place	State FIPS	County FIPS	Place FIPS	2000 Census Counts Tabulation (Original) Total Population	Group Quarters Population	Total Housing Units	Vacant Housing Units	Corrected (Revised) Total Population	Group Quarters Population	Total Housing Units	Vacant Housing Units
Texas	48			20 851 820	581 109	8 157 575	764 221	20 851 790	581 109	8 157 557	764 221
COUNTY											
Collin County	48	085		491 675	3 332	194 892	12 922	491 774	3 332	194 946	12 922
Dallas County	48	113		2 218 899	33 470	854 119	48 498	2 218 774	33 470	854 048	48 498
Taylor County	48	441		126 555	8 354	52 056	4 782	126 551	8 354	52 058	4 782
PLACE											
Abilene city	48	000	01000	115 930	10 932	45 618	4 048	115 926	10 932	45 617	4 048
Jones County (part)	48	253	01000	5 488	4 650	452	82	5 488	4 650	452	82
Taylor County (part)	48	441	01000	110 442	6 282	45 166	3 966	110 438	6 282	45 165	3 966
Aurora town, Wise County	48	497	04672	853	-	332	20	875	-	339	21
Bridgeport city, Wise County	48	497	10264	4 309	352	1 515	132	4 827	870	1 515	132
Hallettsville city, Lavaca County	48	285	31888	2 345	12	1 223	204	2 663	230	1 223	204
Jasper city, Jasper County	48	241	37420	8 247	784	3 467	579	7 657	204	3 467	579
Richardson city	48	000	61796	91 802	809	36 530	1 339	91 776	808	36 513	1 339
Collin County (part)	48	085	61796	20 873	1	8 820	599	20 972	1	8 874	599
Dallas County (part)	48	113	61796	70 929	808	27 710	740	70 804	808	27 639	740
Sachse city	48	000	64084	9 751	-	3 350	120	9 884	-	3 393	127
Collin County (part)	48	085	64084	1 660	-	592	23	1 793	-	635	24
Dallas County (part)	48	113	64084	8 091	-	2 758	103	8 091	-	2 758	103
Venus town	48	000	75236	910	-	344	12	1 892	982	344	12
Ellis County (part)	48	139	75236	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Johnson County (part)	48	251	75236	910	-	344	12	1 892	982	344	12

- represents zero

* * * * * *

Corrections made to the population and housing unit counts by this program will result in the issuance of new official Census 2000 counts to the officials of governmental entities affected by these corrections and may be used by the governmental entities for future programs requiring official Census 2000 data. These corrections also will be:

- used specifically to modify the decennial census file for use in yearly postcensal estimates beginning in December 2002, and
- included in the errata information to be made available via the Internet on the American FactFinder System.

We will NOT incorporate the CQR corrections into Census 2000 data products.

* * * * * *

EFFECTIVE DATE: This program will become effective on June 30, 2001, and will end on September 30, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION: Robert A. Rinaldi, Assistant Division Chief, Decennial Management Division, Count Question Resolution, U.S. Census Bureau, Room 2002/2, 4700 Silver Hill Road, Stop 7100, Washington, DC 20233-7100. Telephone: 1-866-546-0527 (toll free); Fax: 301-763-0260; or E-mail: Count.Question.Resolution@census.gov

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background Information

* * * * * *

Data collection for Census 2000 ended in the Local Census Offices on or before August 30, 2000. This schedule allowed the

Census Bureau time to produce the state level apportionment counts by December 31, 2000, as required by law.

* * * * * *

Executive Orders

This notice has been determined to be not significant for purposes of Executive Order (E.O.) 12866. This program does not contain policies with federalism implications sufficient to warrant preparation of a federalism assessment under E.O. 13132.

* * * * * *

Types of Corrections that will be Considered for the Census 2000 CQR Program

Corrections for three types of challenges will be considered as a result of the Census 2000 CQR program. (For acceptable documentation to initiate such challenges, refer to the section ``Criteria for Acceptable Documentation Necessary to Initiate the Census 2000 CQR Process.")

(1) *Boundary corrections*—Census 2000 respects the proper alignment of the boundaries of actively functioning governmental units and legal administrative areas within governments as legally in effect on January 1, 2000. Census 2000 also uses the boundaries of statistical entities that serve as the surrogates for a legal entity for selected entities as submitted and verified in statistical areas programs. The Census Bureau needs to ensure that the geographic assignment information provided does not, in fact, reflect legal boundary changes made after January 1, 2000 or statistical boundary changes after verification. Problems, such as the inaccurate reporting of legal or statistical area boundaries and the inaccurate recording of such boundaries by the Census Bureau, will be addressed by the CQR program. The boundaries of other geographic areas, such as most census designated places, census

tracts, voting districts, school districts, and similar areas are not in the scope of the Census 2000 CQR program. See question ``3" in the section entitled ``Exhibit--Additional Information" for specific information concerning the geographic entities for which challenges will be processed.

(2) *Geocoding corrections*—These corrections affect the placement of living quarters and associated population within the correct boundaries or census block. Even if the CQR process does not result in a change to the total count for a state, local, or tribal jurisdiction, we will send a letter to the state, local, or tribal government official with a CQR submission when the Census Bureau moves group quarters or housing units to different blocks within the jurisdiction.

(3) *Data Processing corrections*—This category includes data on specific living quarters and persons residing therein that were identified and collected during the Census 2000 process but erroneously included or excluded due to processing errors.

Corrected CQR counts issued will be based on the housing unit and population counts as of April 1, 2000, and may be used by governmental entities for all programs requiring official Census 2000 data. The CQR program is not a mechanism or process to challenge the March 6, 2001, decision of the Secretary of Commerce to release unadjusted numbers from Census 2000 for redistricting purposes; nor is it a mechanism or process to challenge or revise the numbers sent to the President on December 28, 2000, to be used to apportion the U.S. House of Representatives. The Census Bureau will not make corrections to the data concerning the characteristics of the population and housing inventory. The corrected counts will be reflected in the Census Bureau's decennial file modified for use in making postcensal estimates that will be released on a flow basis beginning in December 2002. An inventory of corrections also will be available on the American FactFinder

Internet Data Access System (errata) and updated periodically. Base files for the Census 2000 will remain unrevised so that none of the standard Census 2000 data products will reflect the corrections.

* * * * * *

Definitions of Key Terms

* * * * * *

Block (census block)—A geographic area bounded on all sides by visible features such as streets, roads, streams, and railroad tracks, and occasionally by non-visible boundaries such as city, town, or county limits. Blocks do not cross census tract or block numbering area boundaries. A block is the smallest geographic entity for which the Census Bureau tabulates decennial census information.

Census Tract—A small, relatively permanent statistical subdivision of a county in a metropolitan area or a selected non-metropolitan county, delineated by a local committee of census data users for the purpose of tabulating and presenting decennial census data. Census tract boundaries normally follow visible features, but may follow governmental unit boundaries and other non-visible features. Census tracts generally contain between 1,000 and 8,000 people, and average about 1,700 housing units and 4,000 people.

* * * * * *

Postcensal Estimates—Population estimates for the years following the last published decennial census. Existing data series, such as births, deaths, federal tax returns, medicare enrollment, and immigration and housing unit information are used to update the decennial census counts during the estimating process. These estimates are used in federal funding allocations, monitoring recent demographic trends, and benchmarking many federally funded survey totals.

Public Law 94-171—The federal law amending Section 141 of Title 13 directing the Secretary of Commerce (who delegates that responsibility to the Director of the Census Bureau) to provide selected decennial census data tabulations to the states by April 1 of the year following the census. These tabulations are used by the states to redefine the areas included in each congressional district and the areas used for state and local elections, a process called redistricting.

* * * * * *

Summary File 1—A data file that presents counts and basic cross- tabulations of information collected [[Page 35593]] from all people and housing units. This information includes age, sex, race, Hispanic or Latino origin, household relationship, and whether the residence is owned or rented. Data will be available down to the block level for many tabulations, but limited to the census tract level in cases where there are concerns with disclosure. Summaries also will be included for most other geographic areas, such as places, county subdivisions, ZIP Code tabulation areas and 106th congressional districts.

Exhibit--Additional Information

* * * * * *

Will the Census Bureau incorporate corrections from the CQR process into the apportionment or redistricting data or subsequent data products?

The Census Bureau will not change the apportionment or redistricting counts to reflect corrections resulting from the CQR process. In accordance with the law, apportionment counts were delivered to the President on December 28, 2000, and the counts required for redistricting were delivered to the states by April 1, 2001.

CQR corrections also will not be incorporated in subsequent data products for Census 2000. This will allow the Census Bureau to maintain consistency between data products while maintaining the schedule for timely release of the data. However, the Census Bureau will issue a revised official Census 2000 population and housing unit counts for the affected governmental entity(es), maintain a list of CQR corrected areas on the American Factfinder, and will incorporate any corrections into its Postcensal Estimates program beginning in December 2002.

Dated: June 18, 2001.

William G. Barron, Jr.,

Acting Director, Bureau of the Census.

[FR Doc. 01-16868 Filed 7-5-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-07-P

Appendix D

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

TYLER DIVISION

SIMON BALDERAS, ET AL	§	
	§	CIVIL ACTION
vs.	§	NO. 6:01CV158
	§	
STATE OF TEXAS, ET AL.	§	

This Filing Applies to: All Actions

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, Circuit Judge, HANNAH and WARD, District Judges.

PER CURIAM:

This phase of the redistricting case involves the Texas congressional districts following the 2000 census. After a period of deferral to the State of Texas as mandated in *Growe v. Emison*[1] and the failure of the State to produce a congressional redistricting plan, we are left with the "unwelcome obligation of performing in the legislature's stead."[2] We will describe the course of this litigation

1. 507 U.S. 25 (1993).
2. *Connor v. Finch*, 431 U.S. 407, 415 (1977).

and explain the process by which we drew the congressional redistricting plan which we order.[3]

I

Voters and various officeholders filed multiple lawsuits in state and federal court challenging the districting of Texas' congressional seats and both houses of the state legislature based on the 2000 census.[4] The federal cases were consolidated into the earliest-filed federal action, *Balderas v. Texas*, No. 6:01-CV-158, before this three-judge court.[5] Pursuant to the Supreme Court's direction in *Growe*, on July 23, 2001 we deferred proceedings in federal court until October 1, 2001. We directed that the trial of any challenge to any state-adopted plan for congressional districts, or of any dispute over an appropriate plan to be adopted if the State adopted no plan, would begin on October 15, 2001. Any trials of the disputes over the districts for the state Senate and House would follow in that order. The record in each trial would rest on the trials which preceded it as well as its own. We prescribed the usual pre-trial tasks. All this was to reduce, if not avoid, any delay in the

---

3. The Congressional Districts imposed by this court's Final Judgment shall bear the number 1151C, which is the next number available for public plans within the Texas Legislative Council's RedAppl 2001 computer program.

4. *Balderas v. Texas*, Civil No. 6:01-CV-158 (E.D. Tex.); *Mayfield v. Texas*, Civil No. 6:01-CV-218 (E.D. Tex.); *Manley v. Texas*, Civil No. 6:01-CV-231 (E.D. Tex.); *Del Rio v. Perry*, No. GN-003665 (353rd Dist. Ct., Travis County, Tex.); *Cotera v. Perry*, No. GN-101660 (353rd Dist. Ct., Travis County, Tex.); *Connolly v. Perry*, No. GN-102250 (98th Dist. Ct., Travis County, Tex.); *Associated Republicans of Texas v. Cuellar*, No. 2001-26894 (281st. Dist. Ct., Harris County, Tex.); *Rivas v. Cuellar*, No. 2001-33760 (152nd Dist. Ct., Harris County, Tex.).

5. Other three-judge courts had dismissed prior suits filed prematurely.

electoral process and to follow the specific command of the Supreme Court in *Growe*.

On September 12, 2001, the Texas Supreme Court determined that the Travis County trial court had dominant jurisdiction among the state cases to hear the various plaintiffs' redistricting claims and held that a state trial court in Travis County must decide the districting dispute. The Travis County court commenced trial on September 17, 2001. It heard testimony and arguments from all the parties, concluding trial on September 28, 2001.

On October 1, 2001, at the request of the state trial judge, we extended the deadline for the filing of any congressional redistricting plan to October 3, 2001. On October 3, the state trial court issued a plan, known as 1065C. No provision was made in our October 1 order for the filing of any new plan, although the state trial judge advised that he might modify the plan on or before October 10, 2001. The schedule we had provided did not contemplate major changes in the state court plan filed on October 3. On October 10, 2001, the state court nonetheless issued a new plan, known as 1089C. We immediately delayed the start of any federal trial for one week to October 22 at the request of the parties who pointed to the need for additional time given the substantial differences between the two plans of the state court. On October 19, 2001, however, the Texas Supreme Court vacated the trial court's October 10, 2001 judgment based on a violation of the parties' state constitutional rights and remanded the case to the state trial court.[6] The Texas Supreme Court also concluded that 1065C, the first plan of the state trial court, was not the baseline plan for this court to use, because 1065C was never adopted as a final judgment by the state trial court. The Texas Supreme Court acknowledged that the end result of the state processes left the

---

6. *Perry v. Del Rio*, No. 01-0988, 2001 WL 1285081, at *9 (Tex. Oct. 19, 2001).

federal courts with no choice but to proceed without the benefit of a state plan.[7]

As forecasted by the Texas Supreme Court, we proceeded to trial in Austin, Texas on October 22, 2001, without a state baseline plan in place. This court heard testimony and took evidence on congressional redistricting plans between October 22 and November 1, concluding with final argument on November 2. The parties filed post-trial briefs on November 7, 2001. After reviewing the evidence and the parties' submissions, we now turn to our decision implementing a plan for the redistricting of the Texas congressional districts based on the 2000 census.

II

Federal courts have a limited role in crafting a congressional redistricting plan where the State has failed to implement a plan. The limits are not to be found in the traces of the unconstitutional plan being replaced. "Although a court must defer to legislative judgments on reapportionment as much as possible, it is forbidden to do so when the legislative plan would not meet the special standards of population equality and racial fairness that are applicable to court-ordered plans."[8] Rather, the court must draw a redistricting plan according to "neutral districting factors," including, *inter alia*, compactness, contiguity, and respecting county and municipal boundaries.[9] The 1991 plan as modified in 1996 is conceded by all parties to be unconstitutional, made so by changes in population disclosed by the decennial census, if not also for other reasons. In our effort to steer the required neutral course through this political sea, we have been assisted by the many distinguished political scientists who have testified in this case.

---

7. *Id.*

8. *Upham v. Seaman*, 456 U.S. 37, 39 (1982) (per curiam).

9. *See Abrams v. Johnson*, 521 U.S. 74, 88, 98 (1997); *Miller v. Johnson*, 515 U.S. 900, 916 (1995).

Dr. John Alford, Rice University professor of political science, detailed in his trial testimony a process drawing upon principles of district line-drawing that stand politically neutral. We found that process, substantially parallel to our preliminary thinking and that of other courts, to be the most appropriate for our judicial task.

Our decisional process accepted the reality that, as with so many decisional processes, the sequence of decisions is critical. Starting with a blank map of Texas, we first drew in the existing Voting-Rights-Act-protected majority-minority districts. We were persuaded that the next step had to be to locate Districts 31 and 32, the two new Congressional seats allotted to Texas following the 2000 census. As observed by Dr. Alford, the most natural and neutral locator is to place them where the population growth that produced the new additional districts has occurred.[10] It is self-evident that this locator is, across cases, neutral down to the immediate area, if not in the ultimate, precise fit on the ground. Here the new districts' precise landing was virtually dictated by step 1. When we sent the two new districts to the areas of greatest population growth, Dallas County and Harris County, the districts necessarily landed in the northern half of these counties, and, in the case of District 31, continuing over to Williamson County. Their landing was directed by the location of the protected majority-minority districts in southern Dallas and Harris Counties, which could not be disrupted. Use of this neutral guide was further supported by the circumstance that the Texas legislature has

---

10. We are not the first court to see the wisdom of this choice. *See, e.g., Johnson v. Miller*, 922 F.Supp. 1556, 1563 (S.D. Ga. 1995) (discussing the decision to place Georgia's additional congressional district in high population growth area near Atlanta), *aff'd sub nom., Abrams v. Johnson*, 521 U.S. 74 (1997).

previously located new districts in the areas of greatest population growth.[11]

With a large part of the Texas map thus drawn, we looked to general historic locations of districts in the state, such as the districts in the Panhandle and the northeast corner of the state, the north central districts of the Red River area,[12] through the metropolitan districts and the central plains. We then drew in the remaining districts throughout the state, emphasizing compactness, while observing the contiguity requirement.[13] We struggled to follow local political boundaries that historically have defined communities--county and city lines.[14] In the vernacular, "splits" of counties and cities in our drawing had to be a product of our neutral standards and the demands of population equality. We eschewed an effort to treat old lines as an independent locator, an effort that,

---

11. *See Bush v. Vera*, 517 U.S. 952, 1003 (1996) (Stevens, J., dissenting) ("Because Texas' growth was concentrated in south Texas and the cities of Dallas and Houston, the state legislature concluded that the new congressional districts should be carved out of existing districts in those areas.").

12. *Cf. Johnson*, 922 F.Supp. at 1565 (discussing Georgia's tradition of having four "corner districts" in its congressional plans).

13. *See Good v. Austin*, 800 F.Supp. 557, 563 (E.D. Mich. & W.D. Mich. 1992) ("In addition to serving as a check on gerrymandering compactness 'facilitates political organization, electoral campaigning, and constituent representation.'" (quoting *Karcher v. Daggett*, 462 U.S. 725, 756 (1983) (Stevens, J., concurring))).

14. *See Karcher*, 462 U.S., at 758 (Stevens, J., concurring) ("Subdivision boundaries tend to remain stable over time. Residents of political units such as townships, cities, and counties often develop a community of interest, particularly when the subdivision plays an important role in the provision of governmental services. In addition, legislative districts that do not cross subdivision boundaries are administratively convenient and less likely to confuse the voters." (footnote omitted)).

in any event, would be frustrated by the population changes in the last decade. Nonetheless, the districts fell to their long-held areas, a natural result of the process we have described, much the same as the map drawn at our request by the State using Dr. Alford's neutral approach.

As we have explained, in our efforts to avoid splitting counties and cities, and in particular "double splits," or simultaneously moving populations in and out of a county between two districts, we also strove for compactness and contiguity. Doing so did much to end most of the below-the-surface "ripples" of the 1991 plan and the myriad of submissions before us. For example, the patently irrational shapes of Districts 5 and 6 under the 1991 plan, widely-cited as the most extreme but successful gerrymandering in the country, are no more.

As a check against the outcome of our neutral principles, we asked if the resulting plan was avoidably detrimental to Members of Congress of either party holding unique, major leadership posts. We looked at three Democrats and three Republicans, consensus members of this limited group, each with substantial leadership positions in the Congress. It was plain that these Members were not harmed in their reelection prospects by this plan and that, indeed, no incumbent was paired with another incumbent or significantly harmed by the plan. We thus considered no change in our map in response to this inquiry. Doubtlessly some may see any such weighting as an incumbency factor since congressional leadership so directly correlates with seniority. This view is not without force. Nonetheless, three circumstances must also be considered. First, this correlation is no longer so complete. Second, it does not here offer purchase to one political party over another. And, finally, it reflects a traditional state interest in the power of its congressional delegation distinct from partisan affiliation.

Finally, we checked our plan against the test of general partisan outcome, comparing the number of districts leaning in favor of each party based on prior election results against the percentage breakdown statewide of votes cast for each party in congressional races. This is a traditional last check upon the rationality of any congressional redistricting plan,[15] widely relied-upon by political scientists to test plans, if only in a approximating manner. We found that the plan is likely to produce a congressional delegation roughly proportional to the party voting breakdown across the state. It must be understood that any plan necessarily begins with a Democratic bias due to the preservation of protected majority-minority districts, all of which contain a high percentage of Democratic voters.

III

Various parties urged us to create both African-American and Latino minority districts. These districts are not required by law, as discussed in more detail below, but could be created by the State so long as race was not a predominant reason for doing so. Whether to do so is, however, a quintessentially legislative decision, implicating important policy concerns.[16] We did not avoid creating such a district. At the same time, we did not depart from our neutral factors to draw any district not required by law. To do so would render our effort to keep our thumb off the political scale an illusion.[17]

---

15. *See, e.g., Good*, 800 F.Supp. at 566-67 (using partisan fairness to assess plan drawn according to neutral principles).

16. *See Wyche v. Madison Parish Police Jury*, 635 F.2d 1151, 1160 (5th Cir. Unit A Feb. 1981).

17. *Cf. Abrams*, 521 U.S., at 88.

IV

Finally, to state directly what is implicit in all that we have said: political gerrymandering, a purely partisan exercise, is inappropriate for a federal court drawing a congressional redistricting map.[18] Even at the hands of a legislative body, political gerrymandering is much a bloodfeud, in which revenge is exacted by the majority against its rival. We have left it to the political arena, as we must and wisely should. We do so because our role is limited and not because we see gerrymandering as other than what it is: an abuse of power that, at its core, evinces a fundamental distrust of voters, serving the self-interest of the political parties at the expense of the public good.

V

The parties presented competing plans for redistricting the Congressional seats. We have passed by the approach by which these plans were created in favor of the approach we have described, which we found to be mandated by our position as a federal court engaging in our "delicate task with limited legislative guidance."[19]

Several parties raise Voting Rights Act arguments in support of their preferred plans. In drawing our plan, we have endeavored to

---

18. *See Hunt v. Cromartie*, 526 U.S. 541, 551 (1999); *see generally Davis v. Bandemer*, 478 U.S. 109, 117 n.6 (1986) (plurality opinion of White, J.); *cf. Wyche v. Madison Parish Police Jury*, 769 F.2d 265, 268 (5th Cir. 1985) ("Many factors, such as the protection of incumbents, that are appropriate in the legislative development of an apportionment plan have no place in a plan formulated by the courts.").

19. *Abrams*, 521 U.S., at 101.

ensure that the plan complies with the goals of sections 2[20] and 5[21] of the Voting Rights Act.[22]

Our plan works no retrogression. We have maintained intact the existing districts, and, to the extent the boundaries have changed, as we "zeroed out" the plan, the minority populations have been either enhanced or not diminished in any meaningful way (*i.e.*, by mere fractions of percentages). Thus, although the minority populations in Districts 15, 16, and 30 represent a slightly smaller, but still overwhelming, percentage of the total populations of those districts as compared with the baseline 1991 plan as modified in 1996, we find that these changes do not result in "a retrogression in the position of racial minorities with respect to their effective exercise of the electoral franchise."[23]

The Balderas plaintiffs argue that the congressional plan must contain seven Latino registration majority districts, within nine Latino voting age majority districts, to avoid a section 2 violation. The Martinez intervenors specifically argue for a Latino opportunity district in Dallas County to maintain compliance with section 2. Many parties, including the Texas Coalition of Black Democrats, argue for an African-American opportunity district, generally labeled District 25, in Fort Bend and Harris Counties.

The Latino and African-American plaintiffs thus present competing positions, reflecting a political reality that they are competitors in the political process.[24] This competition finds

---

20. 42 U.S.C. § 1973.

21. 42 U.S.C. § 1973c.

22. *See Abrams*, 521 U.S., at 90, 96.

23. *Beer v. United States*, 425 U.S. 130, 141 (1976); *see also Abrams*, 521 U.S., at 95; *Reno v. Bossier Parish Sch. Bd.*, 520 U.S. 471, 478 (1997).

24. Several political scientists alluded to this political reality in their testimony.

expression in an absence of cohesive voting between Latinos and African-Americans at the point in which it is meaningfully measured, the Democratic primaries.

We find that the plaintiffs have failed to prove that vote dilution will occur in violation of section 2 of the Voting Rights Act in the absence of seven Latino citizenship majority congressional districts or an African-American opportunity district, proposed District 25, in Fort Bend and Harris Counties. The evidence did not persuade us that either Latino or African-American voting age populations are sufficiently numerous to form voting age population majorities in effective districts.[25] The plaintiffs have also not proved that Latinos and African-Americans vote cohesively as required by *Thornburg v. Gingles*[26] so as to constitute a majority in a single-member district.[27]

Looking first to the proposed African-American opportunity district, the Texas Coalition of Black Democrats has conceded that the evidence showed that African-Americans would not be an absolute majority of citizen voting age population in the proposed District 25. Again, the plaintiffs were unable to prove cohesive voting between Latinos and African-Americans sufficient to compel the drawing of a district in Fort Bend and Harris Counties.[28] The overwhelming evidence found to be persuasive was to the contrary.

The matter of creating such a permissive district is one for the legislature.[29] As we have explained, such an effort would require

---

25. *See Valdespino v. Alamo Heights Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 168 F.3d 848, 852-53 (5th Cir. 1999).

26. 478 U.S. 30, 50-51 (1986).

27. *See Valdespino*, 168 F.3d at 852-53.

28. *See Growe*, 507 U.S., at 41.

29. *See Johnson*, 922 F.Supp. at 1567 ("Since political considerations pervade the redistricting task, the Court feels that any permanent footprint left on Georgia's political landscape . . . should be

that we abandon our quest for neutrality in favor of a raw political choice. We offer no opinion as to the wisdom of an appropriate body doing so. Such arranging of voting presents a large and complex decision with profound social and political consequences. The Congress has by its enactment of voting right laws constrained the political process and given the courts a role--to the extent of those constraints. We have no warrant to impose our vision of "proper" restraints upon the political process beyond the constraints imposed by the Constitution or the Voting Rights Act. The Supreme Court put it succinctly in *Growe*, stating that, where there has been no showing establishing the "three *Gingles* prerequisites," then under section 2 of the voting Rights Act "there neither has been a wrong nor can be a remedy."[30] A month later, the Court stated even more directly that, "[o]f course, the federal courts may not order creation of majority-minority districts unless necessary to remedy a violation of federal law."[31]

In sum, these arguments so ably presented by Morris Overstreet, African-American attorney and former state official and candidate for elective office, and others are directed to the wrong forum, however much we may personally admire the arguments. It bears mention that our plan has hardly left a bleak terrain. In District 25 of our plan, the combined African-American and Latino voting age population increased to a 52.3 majority. In the practical world, this percentage will dominate the Democratic primary in a district that has consistently elected a Democratic congressman. This is, then, in a real sense, a minority district produced by our process that enhances the elective prospects of a minority, albeit not wholly the district sought.

---

left to those elected to make such decisions.").

30. 507 U.S., at 41.

31. *Voinovich v. Quilter*, 507 U.S. 146, 156 (1993).

As for the proposed Latino opportunity districts, the evidence shows that the Latino population is not sufficiently compact or numerous to support another, effective majority Latino citizenship district in Texas, in Dallas County or in South Texas.[32] We find that, under the totality of the circumstances, the failure to create seven such districts will not prevent full and equal Latino participation in the political process. It bears mention that our insistence upon compactness has increased the Latino force in District 24, a result supported by Congresswoman Eddie Bernice Johnson in her testimony at trial.

The Valdez-Cox plaintiffs also urge that Webb and Hidalgo Counties be left whole. We heard powerful arguments from the witness stand and counsel in opposition to a splitting of Hidalgo County in South Texas, and our neutral standards stood against such a county split. That standard was ultimately overriden as to Hidalgo County by the mandate of population equality under the principle of one-man, one-vote, and the existence of surrounding protected majority-minority districts. It is an ugly fact that the law's insistence on absolute population equality in court-drawn plans has to perverse effect of splitting counties and cities, when a tolerance of greater deviation would not demand such undesirable divisions. . The split here of Hidalgo County is a fit example.[33] Webb County was not caught in this squeeze and remains wholly intact in District 23.

VI

There being no reason for delay, we direct entry of final judgment in this case pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b).

---

32. *See Growe*, 507 U.S., at 39-40; *Gingles*, 478 U.S., at 50-51; *NAACP v. Fordice*, 252 F.3d 361, 365-67 (5th Cir. 2001).

33. We endeavored to and did respect the municipal boundaries of McAllen, a major population center of Hidalgo County.

So **ordered** and **signed** this 14th day of November, 2001.

/s/ Patrick E. Higginbotham
PATRICK E. HIGGINBOTHAM
UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

/s/ John Hannah, Jr.
JOHN HANNAH, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

/s/ T. John Ward
T. JOHN WARD
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

(3)

No. 03-1400

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
AUG 20 2004
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS, GUSTAVO LUIS "GUS" GARCIA, and CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS,

Appellants,

v.

RICK PERRY, Governor of Texas, *et al.*,

Appellees.

On Appeal From The United States District Court For The Eastern District Of Texas

APPELLANTS' REPLY BRIEF

RENEA HICKS
LAW OFFICE OF
MAX RENEA HICKS
800 Norwood Tower
114 West 7th Street
Austin, Texas 78701
(512) 480-8231
fax: (512) 476-4557

Attorney for Appellants

COCKLE LAW BRIEF PRINTING CO. (800) 225-6964
OR CALL COLLECT (402) 342-2831

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Table of Authorities ii

I. The Court's *Cox v. Larios* invalidation of a partisan gerrymander on one person, one vote grounds dictates, with even greater force, the same kind of invalidation of the Texas congressional partisan gerrymander 2

II. The legal and evidentiary burden to show a non-discriminatory reason for relying on outdated population numbers shifted to the State, as provided in *Karcher v. Daggett* 4

III. The necessary standing exists to press the one person, one vote claim of the Travis County appellants 7

Conclusion 8

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

Baker v. Carr, 369 U.S. 186 (1962) 7

Burns v. Richardson, 384 U.S. 73 (1966) 6

Cox v. Larios, 124 S.Ct. 2806 (2004) 2, 3, 4

Karcher v. Daggett, 462 U.S. 725 (1983) 3, 4, 5, 6

Larios v. Cox, 300 F.Supp.2d 1320 (N.D. Ga. 2004) 2

Larios v. Perdue, 306 F.Supp.2d 1190 (N.D. Ga. 2003) 8

Roman v. Sincock, 377 U.S. 695 (1964) 6

United States v. Hays, 515 U.S. 737 (1995) 8

Vieth v. Jubelirer, 124 S.Ct. 1769 (2004) 2, 6

Wesberry v. Sanders, 376 U.S. 1 (1964) 7

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY

U.S. CONST. ART. I, § 2 1

U.S. CONST. ART. I, § 4 1

APPELLANTS' REPLY BRIEF

Travis County, Gus Garcia, and the City of Austin (collectively, "Travis County appellants") respond to the State's Motion to Affirm.[1]

The State's dismissal argument barely acknowledges the central issue raised here by the Travis County appellants: whether a state may satisfy the constitutional rule of one person, one vote that is at its strictest for congressional districts by blindly relying on the acknowledged legal fiction of inter-censal population stasis, when it voluntarily undertakes mid-decade redistricting for unadulterated partisan purposes. Instead, it devotes considerable space to irrelevancies (such as all of the argument's Part I concerning the mid-decade prohibition issue, State Motion at 8-13),[2] to extended elaborations on matters that are entirely collateral to the issue (such as its lengthy five-paragraph disquisition on the meaning of corrected census numbers, State Motion at 3-4),[3] and to pinched defensive arguments about sub-issues (such as the way burdens of proof shift in the one person, one vote context, State Motion at 13-17).

---

[1] The appellees, collectively termed the "State," are the State of Texas itself and its Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Speaker of the House, and Secretary of State.

[2] The one person, one vote argument of the Travis County appellants rests on the Constitution's Article I, section 2, not on Article I, section 4.

[3] The Travis County appellants devote a scant two sentences in a single footnote to the corrected Census number matter – which the State misleadingly suggests means we "focuse[d]" on its reliability, State Motion at 3. The matter was *mentioned*, not argued.

I. The Court's *Cox v. Larios* invalidation of a partisan gerrymander on one person, one vote grounds dictates, with even greater force, the same kind of invalidation of the Texas congressional partisan gerrymander.

Still worse, the State's studied avoidance of the key issue here extends to downplaying the Court's most recent, and significant, decision on the intersection of the one person, one vote doctrine with partisan gerrymandering – *Cox v. Larios*, 124 S.Ct. 2806 (2004) – by burying it in a footnote. *See* State Motion at 16 n.12. The *Cox v. Larios* affirmance came after the Travis County appellants had filed their jurisdictional statement in this appeal. *Cox v. Larios* involved the linkage between the one person, one vote rule and a blatant partisan gerrymander. The fact that the Court deployed a well-ensconced constitutional rule (equal population) to invalidate a constitutionally-frowned upon political ploy (partisan gerrymandering) whose justiciability has proved a source of difficulty for this Court, *see Vieth v. Jubelirer*, 124 S.Ct. 1769 (2004), makes *Cox v. Larios* quite salient here.

In *Cox v. Larios*, the Court summarily affirmed a district court determination that the equal population rule for state legislative districts was violated when the Georgia Legislature tried to hide blatant partisan gerrymandering behind the 10% variance doctrine, *see Larios v. Cox*, 300 F.Supp.2d 1320 (N.D. Ga. 2004). Justice Stevens, joined by Justice Breyer, concurred, 124 S.Ct. at 2806-2809, with a particularly noteworthy observation about the importance of the one person, one vote doctrine in light of the current status of partisan gerrymandering jurisprudence:

> After our recent decision in *Vieth v. Jubelirer* . . . , the equal-population principle remains the only clear limitation on improper districting practices, and *we must be careful not to dilute its strength.*

124 S.Ct. at 2808 (citation omitted) (emphasis added).

The same principle applies to the Texas congressional redistricting now before the Court, but with greater force because of the more restrictive grip of the equal population rule in the congressional context. If the state-acknowledged partisan gerrymander visited upon the thirty-two Texas congressional districts for no reason other than partisan advantage can successfully hide behind the fiction that Texas population had not shifted at all over two years and seven months (from March 2001 to October 2003), then the strength of the one person, one vote rule laid down in *Karcher v. Daggett*, 462 U.S. 725 (1983), has been seriously diluted. If the equal population rule's dilution was not permitted in the partisan gerrymandering context of *Cox v. Larios*, there is no valid reason for permitting its dilution in this case. The State's *ipse dixit* that the congressional plan "complies perfectly with the requirement of population equality," State Motion at 16 n.12, is perfectly false. It did not, and the fact that it did not is plain.

The State belittles the one person, one vote and discard-the-legal-fiction argument of the Travis County appellants by positing that "no court has ever adopted it." State Motion at 7. That is no surprise, since what the State has done in this case is so beyond the bounds of past practices – even past *aggressive* practices – in the rough-and-tumble realm of redistricting. But *Cox v. Larios* edges so close to the argument urged here as to be indistinguishable. Unless the venerable one person, one vote rule is to be relegated to the "silly" category assigned it by one of the

State's key witnesses (and one of the chief architects of the challenged Texas map),[4] the animating principle of *Cox v. Larios* – that improper partisan gerrymandering may be checked by making the one person, one vote rule meaningful – should result in invalidation of the 2003 Texas congressional redistricting plan. If that is a "back-door" way[5] to check this kind of state activity, it at least has the advantage of being firmly grounded in one of the keynote constitutional doctrines of the last century.

II. The legal and evidentiary burden to show a non-discriminatory reason for relying on outdated population numbers shifted to the State, as provided in *Karcher v. Daggett*.

The State simply ignores governing precedent and plain facts in its argument that the Travis County appellants neither shouldered their burden on the one person, one vote issue nor proffered a legal basis for placing the constitutional onus on the State. State Motion at 13-17. *Karcher v. Daggett* speaks directly to the situation.

Unrebutted evidence from the chief demographer for the City of Austin established that the 2000 census populations, allocated among the thirty-two congressional districts, no longer described the population distribution among those districts by the time the Texas Legislature redistricted them in the Fall of 2003. *See* Declaration of Ryan Robinson: Post-Census 2000 Demographic Change in

---

[4] Bob Davis, chief map-drawer for the Republicans in the Texas Senate, testified that he thought it "silly" to assume the 2000 census numbers were still accurate in 2003, especially in a state as big as Texas. Trial Tr., 12/18/03.

[5] This is the State's characterization. *See* State Motion at 7.

Texas (attached as Appendix A to State Motion). Robinson explained (with emphasis added):

> The enormous population growth that Texas has witnessed over the last three and a half years has not been homogenously spread across the state. Intra-state migration levels between cities and local household formation rates vary dramatically. Census Bureau estimates data reveal a highly uneven pattern of growth and localized decline. . . . [P]opulation growth is a spatially lumpy phenomenon, and using Census 2000 data to create congressional districts *ensures* that the districts will not be balanced with one another in terms of total population.

This uncontradicted testimony overrides what even the State acknowledges, State Motion at 14, is at best a "presumption" in favor of decennial census data. One of the State's own chief witnesses, Mr. Davis, acknowledged the fact of population shift, in the earlier-referenced testimony about the "silly" fiction.

Furthermore, especially in the context of the partisan gerrymander at the heart of the legislature's action, the demographer's testimony triggers the burden shift explained in *Karcher v. Daggett*. *Karcher* established that only "unavoidable" population variances were permitted among congressional districts. 462 U.S. at 730. If those in the shoes of the Travis County appellants here show that there are differences, and that the differences could have been avoided, the burden then shifts to the state:

> If . . . the plaintiffs can establish that the population differences were not the result of a good

> faith effort to achieve equality, the State must bear the burden to achieve some legitimate goal.

462 U.S. at 731.[6]

The Constitution did not *require* the State to use the stale Census numbers. *Burns v. Richardson*, 384 U.S. 73, 91 (1966) (state legislative case, explaining that the Equal Protection Clause "does not require the States to use total population figures derived from the federal census as the standard by which . . . substantial population equivalency is to be measured").[7] The State's effort here, though, was to simply ignore the equality rule and, instead, rely on the inapposite fiction of decade-long population stasis so that it could achieve its admitted partisan gerrymandering goal. And that goal, as all the members of the Court seem to agree in *Vieth v. Jubelirer*, was illegitimate from its inception (regardless of whether its illegitimacy is justiciable). Thus, the necessary burden-shifting occurred, and the State failed to satisfy its burden. This was, in *Karcher*-derived terms, a "bad faith" effort to achieve equality.

---

[6] In the somewhat less restrictive one person, one vote context of state legislative redistricting, the Court has stated that it permits only "minor deviations" that take into account factors that are free from, among other things, "any taint of . . . discrimination." *Roman v. Sincock*, 377 U.S. 695, 710 (1964). Locking in stale population numbers because that is the only way the State could readily enact the redistricting legislation to discriminate against the political party out of power does not meet this standard.

[7] The State has an Office of State Demographer, to which it can turn for reliable and regularly updated population estimates. *See* http://www.txsdc.tamu.edu/tpepp/txpopest.php.

III. The necessary standing exists to press the one person, one vote claim of the Travis County appellants.

The State simply states, without argument, that the City of Austin and Travis County lack standing to press the constitutional claim in this appeal. State Motion at 18. It provides a seemingly specific cite, *Wesberry v. Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1, 8 (1964), as support, but there is nothing in the cited text supporting what the State argues. The Court has reserved this issue from the earliest days of the modern era of reapportionment. *See Baker v. Carr*, 369 U.S. 186, 204 n.23 (1962). There is no reason, however, to try to resolve the question at the jurisdictional statement stage of this appeal. That is because, contrary to the short suggestion at the conclusion of the State's argument, State Motion at 18, Gus Garcia (one of the Travis County appellants) does have standing.

Gus Garcia lives in Travis County, a center of comparatively high population growth in Texas. The county has substantial pieces of three districts – CD 10, CD 21, and CD 25. Given the comparative growth rates across the state, it is appropriate to surmise that the passage of time from the census to enactment of the challenged redistricting plan resulted in each of the three Travis County districts being overpopulated in a comparative sense, meaning that those in them are underrepresented.[8] The

[8] It is particularly inappropriate for the State to hide behind the legal fiction of inter-censal population stability in a context that is the opposite of the reason the fiction was created, then argue that, to even have standing to bring a challenge, a voter must prove in great detail the precise current populations as allocated among the gerrymandered districts. This burden more appropriately rests with the State in the first instance, and a presumption of underrepresentation is warranted

(Continued on following page)

consequence is that Mr. Garcia did establish standing – and that standing allows him to challenge the entire plan that was enacted. *See, e.g., Larios v. Perdue*, 306 F.Supp.2d 1190, 1209 (N.D. Ga. 2003).

CONCLUSION

The Court should note probable jurisdiction.

Respectfully submitted,

RENEA HICKS
LAW OFFICE OF MAX RENEA HICKS
800 Norwood Tower
114 West 7th Street
Austin, Texas 78701
(512) 480-8231
fax: (512) 476-4557

Attorney for Appellants Travis County, Gustavo Luis "Gus" Garcia, and City of Austin

unless the State can prove the facts are otherwise. Additionally, the standing rule of *United States v. Hays*, 515 U.S. 737 (1995), is inapposite in this setting. Unlike in the racial gerrymander context, the representational harm here is in having the state undertake an unforced, blatant statewide gerrymander without bothering to determine current populations with any precision, while simultaneously relying on current political trends. The representational harm reaches all non-Republican residents of the state, or at least those, such as Mr. Garcia, who live in the areas targeted for particularly severe partisan gerrymandering.